

INTERVIEW OF ALEXANDER NIX

U.S. House of Representatives,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, December 14, 2017

The interview in the above matter was held at the law offices Greenberg
Traurig LLC, Suite 1000, 2101 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C., 20037,
commencing at 9:13 a.m.

Present: Representatives Schiff, Quigley, and Speier,

Appearances:

For the PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

For ALEXANDER NIX:

NATHAN MUYSKENS

SARAH M. MATHEWS

L. ANDREW ZAUSNER

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLC.

2101 L Street N.W., Suite 1000.

Washington, D.C. 20037

[REDACTED] All right. Good morning, all. This is a transcribed interview of Mr. Alexander Nix of Cambridge Analytica. Thank you very much for speaking to us today.

For the record, I am [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the majority. There are a number of other members and staff present who will identify themselves as the proceedings get underway.

But before we begin, I wanted to state a few things for the record. Questioning will be conducted by members and staff. During the course of this interview, members and staff may ask questions during their allotted time period. Some questions may seem basic, but that is because we need to clearly establish facts and understand the situation. Please do not assume we know any facts you have previously disclosed as part of any other investigation or review.

And this interview will be conducted at the unclassified level.

We ask that you give complete and fulsome replies to questions based on your best recollection. If a question is unclear or you are uncertain in your response, please let us know. And if you do not know the answer to a question or cannot remember, simply say so.

You are entitled to have counsel present for you during this interview, and we appreciate your accommodation here in your office in D.C. and the VTC equipment for you in London. At this time, if counsel could please state their names for the record.

MR. MUYSKENS: Yes. I'm Nathan Muyskens from Greenberg Traurig, representing Cambridge Analytica. And I've got several colleagues in

Washington. I'll ask them to introduce themselves.

MR. ZAUSNER: Andy Zausner, also representing --

MS. MATHEWS: Sarah Mathews.

██████████ Thank you. The interview will be transcribed. There is a reporter making a record of these proceedings so we can easily consult a written compilation of your answers. Because the reporter cannot record gestures, especially on the TV, we ask that you answer all questions verbally. If you forget to do this, you might be reminded to do so. You may also be asked to spell certain terms or unusual phrases.

Consistent with the committee's rules of procedure, you and your counsel, upon request, will have a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of this interview in order to determine whether your answers were correctly transcribed. The transcript will remain in the committee's custody. And the committee also reserves the right to request your return for additional questions, should the need arise.

The process for the interview is as follows: The minority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions. Then the majority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions. Thereafter, we will take a break if you desire and, after which time, the minority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions and the majority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions. These 15-minute rounds will continue until questioning is complete. There will be time limits for all sides for all rounds. Time will be kept for each portion of the interview, with warnings given at the 5- and 1-minute marks, respectively.

To ensure confidentiality, we ask that you do not discuss the interview with anyone other than your attorney. And you are reminded that it is unlawful to

deliberately provide false information to Members of Congress or staff.

And, lastly, the record will reflect that you are voluntarily participating in this interview, which will be under oath.

Mr. Nix, could you raise your right hand to be sworn?

[Witness sworn.]

[REDACTED] Thank you. And just for recordkeeping purposes, we are at Greenberg Traurig's offices in Washington, D.C., and the witness, Mr. Alexander Nix, is appearing via VTC, video teleconference, at the Greenberg Traurig offices in London in the United Kingdom.

Thank you. The majority has no opening remarks.

Mr. Ranking Member?

MR. SCHIFF: No. Thank you for being with us. We look forward to your testimony.

MR. NIX: Thank you, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Mr. Nix, good morning here, good afternoon there.

Thanks for your participation.

Could I begin by asking you -- I assume you are a U.K. citizen, your citizenship?

MR. NIX: That is correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. And do you travel very much to the United States?

MR. NIX: Yes, I travel fairly frequently to the United States.

MR. QUIGLEY: Cambridge Analytica has an office in New York City. Is that correct?

MR. NIX: Yes, that is correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: So I assume you're here often for work.

MR. NIX: I am in the States certainly every month, at a minimum, for work.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, I guess my first question in that vein is, were you unwilling to have this sort of interview in person?

MR. NIX: Not at all. I offered to attend in person.

MR. SCHIFF: Why are we doing it this way then, counsel? This is the only interview we've conducted in this fashion. If Mr. Nix is here frequently and willing to come in person, why are we doing this by video conference on a day we have a --

MR. MUYSKENS: Well, it was represented to us that this had to be done sooner rather than later. And because of Mr. Nix's travel schedule, he was not going to be in the United States in December. So --

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Nix, when were you last in the United States?

MR. NIX: I'd have to confirm, but I would say November.

MR. SCHIFF: We had made a request prior to November for your testimony, so I don't understand. If I could ask my majority colleagues why we didn't have Mr. Nix come in in person.

██████████ I don't know when --

MR. NIX: Well, I availed myself to you gentlemen for this inquiry. And it was not possible to get the dates to work for all parties, and so this was the best alternative.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, Mr. Nix, actually, I was addressing my question to my majority colleagues, since we had asked for your testimony some time before. This is not an issue of your willingness, it appears; it's an issue of why the majority didn't schedule this in person.

██████████ We did not schedule this in person because, as Mr. Nix

stated, this was the first time that we could get Mr. Nix during the time period that is relevant. So we appreciate his willingness to appear, and we're ready to proceed.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Nix, when were you first contacted by the committee for your testimony?

MR. MUYSKENS: We could find the letter, but it will take a minute. I don't have it right in front of me.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, approximately.

MR. NIX: I'm going to speculate. A month ago, possibly.

MR. SCHIFF: Was it before or after your last trip to the United States?

MR. NIX: Again, any answer would be speculative. Without pulling out my diary and, indeed, the letter inviting me to join this inquiry, I wouldn't be able to answer.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, we would ask you to provide the committee with the last dates that you were in the United States. If you can't do it at this moment, we'd ask you to provide it during a recess.

MR. NIX: Of course. No problem, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sir, let me ask you this: How did you find out that candidate Trump was running for President?

MR. NIX: Well, Trump announced his candidacy in 2015, I believe, from Trump Tower. It was fairly -- fairly public and covered by most of the major news networks. And, obviously, you know, we follow these kinds of news.

MR. QUIGLEY: Who recommended you and Cambridge Analytica to the campaign?

MR. NIX: Well, actually, I started engaging with the Trump campaign in

mid-2015 to inquire as to the possibility of being able to support their Presidential nomination bid with our services. And so I opened up a dialogue at that time with the then-campaign manager, who was Corey Lewandowski. And I continued to engage and to pursue this line of inquiry for some 12 months until we eventually started working for the campaign after Trump won the nomination.

MR. QUIGLEY: You started working for the campaign. What month was that then?

MR. NIX: That was in June 2016. So a little after -- a little over a year after I first contacted the Trump campaign.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, besides Mr. Lewandowski, who were you in contact with in the period between his announcement and the time you were hired?

MR. NIX: So I was predominantly liaising with Mr. Lewandowski. After he stood down or resigned from being campaign manager, I had one discussion with Paul Manafort, who was brought in as the new campaign manager. And I also had discussions and met with Jared Kushner and also with Brad Parscale.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, when was that switch when it went from Mr. Lewandowski to Mr. Manafort for you? When did you start communicating with Mr. Manafort instead?

MR. NIX: Well, it would be difficult for me to specify the date, but the period was after Mr. Lewandowski was removed as campaign manager and, obviously, after Mr. Manafort was instated as campaign manager.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do you remember which month --

MR. NIX: I believe I had one meeting with Paul Manafort in Trump Tower to discuss how we might be able to support the campaign, but no further meetings because Mr. Manafort was subsequently removed as campaign manager. So

those discussions stopped.

MR. QUIGLEY: So do you recall roughly what month that was that you met in Trump Tower with Mr. Manafort?

MR. NIX: I'm speculating that it would have been around May 2016, maybe early May.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. And just to get the timeframe set, the next person you talked to after Mr. Manafort about joining the campaign or involvement in the campaign was Mr. Kushner?

MR. NIX: That is correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: And, roughly, if you could approximate which month and year was that that you first communicated with Mr. Kushner?

MR. NIX: Again, I'm speculating, but that would -- I'm suggesting possibly end of May/early June, those discussions were being carried out.

MR. QUIGLEY: To your understanding, who was it that made the decision to bring you on, which of the campaign associates?

MR. NIX: Well, obviously, again, we wouldn't know that necessarily, but if I, again, had to speculate, I would suggest that it was a combination of Jared Kushner and Brad Parscale.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you have communications with Mr. Parscale after Mr. Kushner?

MR. NIX: Yes, I did. And -- sorry. Continue, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: And the discussions with Mr. Parscale, they took place just after Mr. Kushner or on an ongoing basis?

MR. NIX: They ran in parallel. The initial contact was with -- between myself and the campaign -- was with Mr. Kushner, but some of my colleagues at

Cambridge Analytica were independently speaking to Mr. Parscale, and then we coordinated the dialogue.

And I had some of my colleagues who were working or seeking to work in a more tactical level were speaking to Mr. Parscale. And I was speaking to Jared Kushner at a more commercial level about how we could support the campaign and what the terms of that -- that engagement might look like.

MR. QUIGLEY: Now, the colleagues that you speak of from Cambridge, were they with you in -- it's London, correct?

MR. NIX: No, not necessarily. Some of them might have been based in London, and some of them might have been based out of either D.C. or New York office.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do you know who your colleagues were that were in communication before your firm was hired with the Trump associates?

MR. NIX: Yes. Principally, two or three of my colleagues were speaking with Brad Parscale. That would have been my chief data officer, Dr. Alex Taylor; head of product, who is a gentleman called Matt Oczkowski; and the head of digital, which was a lady called Molly Schweickert.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, during the course of the campaign, who was the principal with Cambridge that was in communication with the Trump campaign during the course of your work with the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: On a day-to-day level, I would suggest that Matt Oczkowski was probably the point of contact between the Trump campaign, which was being represented by Brad Parscale, in terms of our dealings and, obviously, Cambridge Analytica.

MR. QUIGLEY: Could you do me a favor and spell Matt's last name, if you

can?

MR. NIX: Yes, certainly, sir. I'll just look that up for you.

O-c-z-k-o-w-s-k-i.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you. So let me run some names by you. And, again, during the course of the campaign, whom did you meet with or communicate with in the Trump campaign, starting with the candidate himself? Did you meet candidate Trump?

MR. NIX: During the campaign, I only met President Trump on the night of polling.

MR. QUIGLEY: The night of what?

MR. NIX: Of polling.

MR. QUIGLEY: Oh, you mean election?

MR. NIX: The night of the election. Election night.

MR. QUIGLEY: Where was that?

MR. NIX: In Trump Tower.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. And the nature of that meeting?

MR. NIX: Oh, the parties that had been supporting the campaign were gathered in Trump Tower to watch the results coming in. We were there from about 7:30 or 8 o'clock in the evening, maybe 7:30 in the evening, until about 3 in the morning.

MR. QUIGLEY: Your meeting with the candidate, how long was that?

MR. NIX: I was introduced to him as part of the campaign team. It was -- it was as brief as a handshake.

MR. QUIGLEY: Another name, Jared Trump. I'm sorry -- Jared Kushner.

MR. NIX: I'm not familiar with that person.

MR. QUIGLEY: I'm sorry. Jared Kushner.

MR. NIX: Jared Kushner. Jared Kushner I met initially in New York at his offices. Again, that's -- as I said before, I can speculate that was in late May. And that meeting was to discuss Cambridge Analytica being on-boarded by the campaign to provide services.

MR. QUIGLEY: And that was the only meeting with Mr. Kushner?

MR. NIX: I'm hesitating because I believe it was the only meeting because I can't recall a followup meeting. There were certainly a number of conversations on the telephone, but I believe that was the only meeting, but it would be very easy to confirm that for you.

MR. QUIGLEY: Ivanka Trump?

MR. NIX: I have never met Ivanka Trump, although she was present in Trump Tower on the evening of the election. I just wasn't presented to her.

MR. QUIGLEY: Steve Bannon?

MR. NIX: I first met Steve Bannon in 2013, maybe late 2012, sir. And I've been in regular and frequent communication and meetings with him over the last 5 years.

MR. QUIGLEY: During the course of the campaign, your communication with Steve Bannon, was that in person, by phone, by internet?

MR. NIX: Probably all of the above. I would likely have met with him a few times just because we shared common friends and colleagues. I'm sure that we shared emails and/or telephone calls with each other.

MR. QUIGLEY: Now, you say you met him you think several times. Would that have been in the United States?

MR. NIX: Yes, it would have.

MR. QUIGLEY: No other visits outside the United States with Mr. --

MR. NIX: No, I believe that -- I believe I wouldn't -- he never came to England, and that would have been the only other place. So the answer is only in the United States.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, other than that, you would have had email communication with him?

MR. NIX: That is correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: And just for the record, would that have been part of the materials you provided in your production, those emails?

MR. NIX: If there were emails between myself and Steve Bannon, then you would have received them.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you have any other forms of communicating with him on social media?

MR. NIX: Steve Bannon's preferred method of communication is by phone.

MR. QUIGLEY: So you're saying there would be no Twitter, no other forms of social media between the two of you?

MR. NIX: I don't use Twitter, sir, and I don't really engage with social media, such as Facebook and things like that. I don't have an account.

MR. QUIGLEY: Rick Gates.

MR. NIX: I met Rick Gates once, and that was on the same day that I met Paul Manafort, at the same meeting. I met with them both for about 40 minutes. It was the only time that I've ever met Paul Manafort or Rick Gates, and that conversation was entirely about us trying to work for the Trump campaign, obviously, Cambridge Analytica.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sure. You mentioned Mr. Manafort there, and that's the only time you had met Mr. Gates or Mr. Manafort. Were you in communication with either of those two gentlemen, by phone or by social media?

MR. NIX: If I had been, the only communication would have been to set up the meeting that we had and then to follow up on that meeting to understand if there was appetite to move an engagement forward. Whether that was done by myself -- probably the setting up of the meeting might have been done by my office or my secretary, but not by myself. It might have been done by telephone call. I'd have to have a look at the emails we sent you.

I would have thought it quite likely that I followed up with a thank you for the meeting, but before -- before anything substantial was taken forward in terms of an engagement, Mr. Manafort was removed as campaign manager. So the conversation ended anyway.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yeah. And Mr. Lewandowski at some point left as well, correct?

MR. NIX: Well, Mr. Lewandowski left before Mr. Manafort was appointed. Hence, Mr. Manafort was appointed.

MR. QUIGLEY: No, I understand. What I want to ask is, did you stay in touch with either of those two gentlemen by any other means?

MR. NIX: No, absolutely not. I had no personal relationship with either Mr. Lewandowski nor with Mr. Manafort nor with Mr. Gates.

MR. QUIGLEY: Let me ask you about Dan Scavino.

MR. NIX: I'm afraid I don't know who that gentleman is.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. You talked about your meeting with Mr. Kushner. I believe the date would be June 9th, 2016.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. NIX: My apologies. It sounds like you know better than I. That could certainly be correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Do you recall where this meeting took place?

MR. NIX: Yes. It took place in his office.

MR. QUIGLEY: In Trump Tower?

MR. NIX: No. His business office, not his campaign office. I can't remember where that was, but it was in Manhattan.

MR. QUIGLEY: What were the circumstances for the two of you meeting?

MR. NIX: I was very interested to speak to him about the possibility of supporting the Trump campaign, and -- and that was why I reached out to him.

MR. QUIGLEY: And when you were discussing your opportunities to work for the Trump campaign, were you -- is this, in a sense, a sales pitch?

MR. NIX: Entirely.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Did you or he talk about the type of work that you would do as it involves Russia or hacked emails at all between the two of you?

MR. NIX: Absolutely not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Who else was present at that meeting?

MR. NIX: No one else was present at that meeting.

MR. QUIGLEY: So at that -- to make sure I understand, you were at his business office on that June 9th date. Did you meet or encounter at that location or that day Rob Goldstone?

MR. NIX: No, I'm not familiar with who Rob Goldstone is.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Natalia Veselnitskaya?

MR. NIX: No, I'm afraid not, sir. I don't know that name.

MR. QUIGLEY: Then you never would have met her, correct?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. NIX: I've never met her.

MR. QUIGLEY: Rinat Akhmetshin?

MR. NIX: I've never met that person nor heard that name.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Ike Kaveladze?

MR. NIX: I've never met that person nor heard that name.

MR. QUIGLEY: And Donald Trump Jr.?

MR. NIX: I have heard that name, but I've never been introduced nor met Donald Trump Jr.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever had communication with Donald Trump Jr.?

MR. NIX: No, I've never had communication with him.

MR. QUIGLEY: Let's shift over to the issue of WikiLeaks. Have you ever spoken with Julian Assange?

MR. NIX: No, I've never spoken to Julian Assange.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever communicated with Julian Assange, by phone, by any sort of email or social media of any sort?

MR. NIX: I've never communicated with Julian Assange.

MR. QUIGLEY: Or have you communicated by any means with any member of WikiLeaks?

MR. NIX: No, I've never communicated with any member of WikiLeaks.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you ever reach out to WikiLeaks or anyone associated or working for WikiLeaks to obtain information about this campaign or about Hillary Clinton?

MR. NIX: Yes, I did. I asked my office to contact WikiLeaks, and they connected with a speaking agency. That is a public speaking agency that

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

represents Julian Assange. And we sent them a message asking if Julian Assange would be willing to take a telephone call with me.

MR. QUIGLEY: And when was that? When did that take place, that outreach?

MR. NIX: I couldn't tell you, sir, but I could very easily look that up in the documentation and revert to you in recess.

MR. QUIGLEY: So what was the purpose of that -- your attempt to reach out to them?

MR. NIX: I had read an article in the British newspaper The Guardian which had indicated that WikiLeaks were -- had acquired and were going to publish some information relevant to the outcome or relevant to the election in the United States. And we wanted to find out what information they had and whether they would share it with us, such that we would be able to understand the content of that information before it became public.

MR. QUIGLEY: What was your understanding of what that information was?

MR. NIX: My understanding was only what was published in the newspaper article, which was -- which itself was somewhat vague, but it indicated that WikiLeaks had -- had a copy of Hillary Clinton's emails.

MR. QUIGLEY: So you were reaching out to them to see if you could get the Hillary Clinton emails?

MR. NIX: That is correct, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: And what was your intention of what you would do with those emails?

MR. NIX: Well, I think that most people recognize that those emails were

of great concern and interest, not just to political consultants but to all media outlets across the United States and beyond, and they could have had a profound impact on the outcome of the election. And we, therefore, wanted to understand what was contained in those, such that we could integrate that knowledge into our campaign strategy.

MR. QUIGLEY: You were going to use those emails to publicize them, correct?

MR. NIX: Well, that's hypothetical, because we received an answer back from WikiLeaks that they did not wish to take a telephone call or otherwise engage with us. So to speculate on what may have happened is really not relevant.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, we don't have to speculate on what your intention was. What was your intention if you got the Hillary Clinton emails?

MR. NIX: Well, my intention would have been informed by the content of the emails. So, without having seen the emails, it's impossible to share with you what my intention was.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you share this willingness to get this, these emails with anyone on the Trump campaign or associated with the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: I did not share this with anyone on the Trump campaign. I only shared this with colleagues of mine.

MR. QUIGLEY: Colleagues --

MR. NIX: Colleagues who are not part of the Trump campaign.

MR. QUIGLEY: They're colleagues that work just for Cambridge?

MR. NIX: Not necessarily worked for Cambridge, but colleagues or associates of mine that were not part of the Trump campaign.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, who were they?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. NIX: I shared this -- we have this here?

MR. MUYSKENS: And just so you all know, we're looking at the document that is Bates stamped CA0000077. It's one of the documents [REDACTED] provided as well.

And, Mr. Schiff, I know you have your own procedures, but if you want to ask a question to help Mr. Quigley along, we're absolutely fine with that.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, looking at the documents Bates stamped -- that you referenced, Bates stamped ending 0077, that's an email from Peter Schweizer, who is the author of a book on the Clinton finances, responding to an email from you. Can you tell us a little bit about how that came about?

MR. NIX: Sir, I think the original email was a third party with whom I wasn't previously acquainted and I'm not acquainted called Lisa Fleischmann wrote to Rebekah Mercer --

MR. MUYSKENS: And we're currently referencing Bates label 78, the subsequent document.

MR. NIX: And, as you can see for yourselves, she is suggesting that these emails might be of interest. And I indicated that -- that we'd be -- if we could help in any capacity, we would, but suggested that Peter had already taken an initiative in this regard.

MR. SCHIFF: In the original email -- and I guess this was dated August 26th -- this is responding to, as you were saying, a question from Rebekah Mercer about collecting information on Hillary Clinton. It states: I think that Peter has already amassed the key data on Hillary. However, I will task to the team and assess the feasibility of expanding on his work and revert ASAP. FYI: 2 months ago Cambridge Analytica contacted Julian Assange directly to ask him to share

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Hillary's hacked emails with us to disseminate. And he said no, but it looks like he intends to do it himself, so maybe he will address the problem for us.

Is that your language or someone else's?

MR. NIX: That email, it's clearly written from -- sent from my email account.

MR. SCHIFF: So that's your language?

MR. NIX: That is correct, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, you reference in there that -- that you reached out to Assange or your company reached out to Assange to ask him to share Hillary's hacked emails with us to disseminate. So that would indicate that your purpose was dissemination, was it not?

MR. NIX: Again, firstly, I'm not entirely sure of the relevance of this.

And, secondly, because the answer was no, we will never know what the ultimate purpose was, because the intention clearly could have been influenced by the content of the emails. So --

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Nix, you don't think it's relevant that you were communicating with someone that you were seeking Hillary's hacked emails to disseminate? Somehow you think that's irrelevant?

MR. MUYSKENS: I think you're mischaracterizing what he said, but --

MR. SCHIFF: Well, I think he just said that he didn't see the relevance. Did you not?

MR. MUYSKENS: We can argue about this all day, but you are mischaracterizing it.

MR. SCHIFF: Really. Would you read back what Mr. Nix said?

[The reporter read back the record as requested.]

MR. SCHIFF: Let me ask you again, Mr. Nix. Were you seeking these emails, these hacked emails to disseminate them?

MR. NIX: With respect, sir, that's the wrong question to ask.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, with respect, sir, I'll decide the right questions to ask, and your job is to answer them. Was it your purpose in reaching out to Julian Assange and WikiLeaks to disseminate the hacked emails?

MR. NIX: My purpose was to understand, firstly, whether WikiLeaks had the hacked emails -- it's still not clear whether they did or do -- and, secondly, to understand the content of these emails. And, thereafter, we would make a decision on whether it was relevant and germane to what we were -- to the campaign that we were running as to whether they should be disseminated and shared with the general public.

MR. SCHIFF: So when you told -- and you were replying to who on this email?

MR. NIX: It looks like this email is being sent to Rebekah Mercer.

MR. SCHIFF: So, when you told Rebekah Mercer that you -- Cambridge Analytica had contacted Julian Assange directly to ask him to share Hillary Clinton's hacked emails with us to disseminate, you were using shorthand that indicated that if they were pertinent and helpful to the campaign, you intended to disseminate them. Is that accurate?

MR. NIX: I was using -- using shorthand to indicate that if it had been in the best interests of the campaign to disseminate them, then we would have.

MR. SCHIFF: And when you said that he looks like -- he looks like he intends to do it himself so maybe he will address the problem before us, what problem are you referring to?

MR. NIX: Well, the problem of -- of bringing these -- the contents of these emails to light.

MR. SCHIFF: So that was the goal then, to bring these emails to light?

MR. NIX: That was the goal, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And when, as best you can tell us, was this outreach to WikiLeaks made?

MR. NIX: Well, according to the document 0077, about 2 months before this email was sent, which would suggest late June.

MR. SCHIFF: And, again, who on your staff made the outreach?

MR. NIX: My PA.

MR. SCHIFF: And who is that?

MR. NIX: A young lady called Livia Krisandova, who is also copied on this email.

MR. SCHIFF: And did they make that outreach to WikiLeaks by phone or by email or both?

MR. NIX: I don't know, sir. I'd have to check with her. But please let me clarify. They didn't make this outreach to WikiLeaks. She made an outreach to a speaking agency that represented Julian Assange. There was an intermediary that she connected with, not to WikiLeaks themselves.

MR. SCHIFF: And the records, if these were in email form, from your personal assistant to the speaker's bureau representing Julian Assange, would those have been provided to the committee?

MR. NIX: I can only assume so, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, do you know?

MR. MUYSKENS: I don't think any emails from Ms. Krisandova to anyone

at the speaker's bureau exist. I think it was all done telephonically, but I'm not testifying.

MR. QUIGLEY: Can I just ask who was this -- I think you referred to it as a speaking agency. What was the name of that speaking agency?

MR. NIX: I don't know, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, she would know because she contacted them, correct?

MR. NIX: I -- you would assume so, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: So we would need to speak with her to get this information?

MR. MUYSKENS: You could probably utilize Google and figure out who Julian Assange's agent for giving speeches and other commercial engagements is.

MR. SCHIFF: But we couldn't use Google to find out what her communications were with the bureau. So I assume we would need to talk with her -- pardon me?

MR. MUYSKENS: Go ahead. I'm sorry. There's a 1-second delay because of the international call.

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah.

MR. MUYSKENS: We're cutting -- I will try to stop talking a second earlier.

MR. SCHIFF: No, no. This is not an ideal way to interview people, but it is what it is. We thank you.

So, if we want to find out about the communications between your personal assistant and the speaker's bureau representing Julian Assange, we would need to talk with her directly. That's not something that's within your personal knowledge?

MR. NIX: Well, or you could speak to the speaker's bureau that represents Julian Assange.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, we'd have more confidence, I hope, in the candor of your staff than Mr. Assange's representatives, but we will follow up with that.

MR. NIX: I don't think that you can -- I don't think that -- all right, sir, we agree.

MR. SCHIFF: We can rely on the candor of your staff, right?

MR. NIX: The point I was making is that you can't associate that the speaker's agency has the same reputation that you're suggesting that Mr. Assange has.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you don't know the speaker's agency and neither do I. I'm not prepared to vouch for a representative of Julian Assange. So we'll be happy to follow up with your staff.

Were there more than one approach made to WikiLeaks, either through the speaker's bureau or otherwise, by Cambridge Analytica?

MR. NIX: No.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, this -- part of this exchange involved Rebekah Mercer. What was her relationship with Cambridge Analytica?

MR. NIX: Rebekah Mercer is an investor in Cambridge Analytica.

MR. SCHIFF: And -- and how long has she been an investor in Cambridge Analytica?

MR. NIX: Since the company was incorporated.

MR. SCHIFF: And does she have a large enough investment in the company to inform what clients the company takes on or the direction of the work that Cambridge Analytica does?

MR. NIX: Cambridge Analytica is a private company, and we don't discuss our shareholders or their investments.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, did Rebekah Mercer have a role with the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: No.

MR. SCHIFF: Was she a supporter of the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: You'd have to ask her that, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, I'm asking you if you know whether she was supporting the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: Well, I can tell you that the Mercers were very openly backing Senator Cruz as their candidate of choice.

MR. SCHIFF: Until what point?

MR. NIX: Clearly, until Senator Cruz lost the nomination.

MR. SCHIFF: And at that point, did the Mercers become involved in the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: Again, I can't speak for someone else in this inquiry. I can obviously address anything that I may be able to shed light on, but I can't put words in someone else's mouth.

MR. SCHIFF: Of course, I'm not asking you to put words in someone else's mouth. I'm asking you only, to your knowledge, did the Mercers then back Donald Trump?

MR. NIX: My suggestion would be that they wanted to back the Republican candidate, whomever that may have been, the winning Republican candidate.

MR. SCHIFF: And, to your knowledge, did they back Donald Trump?

MR. NIX: Clearly, Trump was the winning candidate.

MR. SCHIFF: Is there a reason you don't want to answer the question?

MR. NIX: Is there a reason that you don't want to join the dots?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes, because I'm asking what your personal knowledge is. I'm not the one testifying here. I'm asking you the question.

Do you know whether Rebekah Mercer supported Donald Trump's campaign or was involved in the campaign --

MR. NIX: No, I don't know.

MR. SCHIFF: So you never discussed the Trump campaign with Rebekah Mercer then?

MR. NIX: Yes, I did discuss it.

██████████ Five minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: And yet you don't know whether she was supporting the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: It's a very open-ended question.

MR. SCHIFF: All right. Well, let's do it this way: Tell us about your conversations with Rebekah Mercer on the subject of the Trump campaign.

MR. NIX: Rebekah Mercer wanted the Republicans to win the Presidency. Therefore, she wanted to support whoever was the Republican candidate. How deep her feelings went for President Trump as opposed to any other candidate, I couldn't begin to speculate on. That's the point I'm trying to make.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, the point I'm trying to make is: Please tell us about your conversations with Rebekah Mercer on the subject of the Trump campaign.

MR. NIX: Which particular conversations?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let's start with the first conversations.

MR. NIX: I couldn't begin to answer that. We talked a lot about politics. I run a political consultancy. So to identify what the first conversation was on Trump would be almost impossible.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let's do our best. So, at some point, you were approaching the Trump campaign in the hopes of taking them on as a client. Did you discuss that with Rebekah Mercer?

MR. NIX: I think I told Rebekah Mercer that we'd opened a dialogue with the Trump campaign, and there seemed to be no issue with that. So I continued to pursue the matter.

MR. SCHIFF: And what was her reaction when you told her you were pursuing the Trump campaign as a client?

MR. NIX: Fine.

MR. SCHIFF: Did she offer to assist in any way in making connections between you and any of the campaign personnel?

MR. NIX: I don't recall that, but I don't know that Rebekah particularly knew many of the Trump campaign or Trump team.

MR. SCHIFF: And when would you have had this initial conversation approaching -- about approaching the Trump campaign? Would it have been before you talked to the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: Well, I started speaking to the Trump campaign in May 2015 or June 2015. So it might have been at that time.

MR. SCHIFF: And is there anything else you can recall from this initial conversation with Rebekah Mercer about approaching the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: No.

MR. SCHIFF: And when would you have next discussed the Trump

campaign with her?

MR. NIX: I would have likely kept her abreast of any meetings that I had with Corey Lewandowski, but seeing as none of those meetings bore any fruit, there would have been little to share with her.

MR. SCHIFF: And when would you have had the first conversation with her, or did you discuss, apart from these emails, with her the Hillary Clinton emails?

MR. NIX: Well, it looks like that the first time that -- it looks like that Rebekah reached out to me, pursuant to receiving an email from a Lisa Fleischmann inquiring whether this was something that Cambridge or GIA could easily do.

MR. SCHIFF: And had you discussed the Hillary Clinton emails with Rebekah Mercer prior to this email?

 One minute.

MR. NIX: I don't think so. And that would be backed up by the fact that I referenced in my email to her: For your information, 2 months ago, we contacted Julian Assange directly to ask him blah, blah, blah.

That would indicate that she wasn't aware of this fact, and I'm making her aware of it in this email.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you have any subsequent discussion with her about the subject of the Hillary Clinton emails?

MR. NIX: Not to my knowledge, no.

MR. SCHIFF: So, even though you hadn't obtained them, they were being published at some point. Did you discuss them at the time of their publication by WikiLeaks or DCLeaks or Guccifer 2?

MR. NIX: Were they ever published? I'm not sure if these were ever published, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, are you referring to which particular emails then? Because, obviously, there were lots of Democratic Party and Podesta emails that were published by WikiLeaks, DCLeaks, and Guccifer 2. Which emails were you referring to?

MR. NIX: Well, again, I'd have to check the timing on this, but I believe there were some emails that were published initially. And this correspondence refers to a second batch of emails that WikiLeaks alleged to have obtained and said they were going to publish, but I don't know and certainly can't confirm now whether they were actually published. I think they weren't. And so we don't know if they ever did have them at all.

MR. SCHIFF: And which specific emails are you referring to, because it's not clear from your own email that you had a particular set of Clinton emails in mind?

MR. NIX: I think, at the time that this was unfolding, there was very little understanding about what information WikiLeaks had or did not have and what information they intended to publish.

The entire genesis of this idea was spawned from reading a newspaper article that suggested that WikiLeaks had received this information and they were going to publish it. And I deemed it in the public interest to try and expedite that process.

MR. SCHIFF: We'll continue after the majority. Thank you.

██████████ Mr. Nix, thanks very much. Again, I'm ██████████ for the majority here. I appreciate your cooperation and voluntariness to appear for this

interview.

As a fact witness, I would just want to sort of try and understand some basics, so you'll forgive me if I don't have an understanding of Cambridge Analytica.

MR. MUYSKENS: Can you get closer to the microphone, by chance?

██████████ Sorry. Is that better?

MR. MUYSKENS: That is much better. Thank you very much.

EXAMINATION

BY ██████████

Q I was just saying I appreciate your willingness to come in and testify, Mr. Nix, and cooperate with this investigation. As a fact witness, I would just want to establish some basic facts, so if you'll just forgive me for not knowing the depths of your business, but can you tell me what Cambridge Analytica does?

A Cambridge Analytica is a data-driven communications agency; that is, we use big data and predictive analytics to build very targeted models for communication and engagement campaigns.

Q And how long has Cambridge Analytica been in existence?

A I believe we were incorporated in early 2013, but we started working in late 2012.

Q How many campaigns have you or Cambridge Analytica worked on or for?

A Cambridge Analytica is an affiliate of a British company called SCL. And over the last 25 years or so, we've probably worked on over 200 national campaigns for Prime Minister and Presidents globally and an equal amount of smaller campaigns, such as congressional and State races and mayoral races and

similar.

Q Thank you. And your title at Cambridge Analytica, sir?

A CEO.

Q Thank you. You referenced in the closing remarks when Mr. Schiff was questioning you about some article that caused your attention to be brought to a certain matter. Can you tell us about this article and what the substance of it was?

A I really can't recall the article, but I'm sure you could find it, sir. The British newspaper The Guardian published a story that said WikiLeaks has obtained these emails and is due to publish them. I'd never heard anything about these emails prior to reading that. And I had -- I turned to my colleague and said: Wow, if that's true, that could seriously impact the election. If we could get hold of those, it would be -- it would be very interesting.

Q Can you give us an approximate date of when you learned that information for the first time in The Guardian news article?

A Well, I'm suggesting that it was around mid-June 2016.

Q And at that time, you already had an employment relationship with the Trump campaign?

A I believe we started working for the Trump campaign sometime between the 12th and the 18th of June. So we think that the initial outreach to WikiLeaks happened prior to this date.

Q Okay. So the initial outreach, when you say the "initial outreach," the initial outreach that was part of the discussion with the minority, is that what you're referencing?

A Yes. When I say "outreach to WikiLeaks," I actually mean outreach to

the speaking agency. So I think The Guardian article, newspaper article, came out in early June. I asked my PA, my secretary, to follow up on that. It took her a day or a week to identify a contact. The best that she could come up with was the speaking agency that represents Julian Assange.

I believe she then reached out to them -- and I can't confirm how she reached out to them, but I'm assuming it was by telephone -- and asked them if they could -- would be interested to take a call with me. And she received a no reply, as you are aware.

Q Thank you. So, just to clarify the timeline, the outreach from Cambridge Analytica to the speaking agency which was in communication with WikiLeaks, that happened before Cambridge Analytica's employment relationship began with the Trump campaign?

A Having looked through the emails and discussed the matter with my counsel, our assumption is that that happened before we were engaged by the campaign.

Q And your first knowledge of anything -- let's call it WikiLeaks and emails, let's put it in that bucket -- you're testifying came from The Guardian news article, which, again, was published before your relationship with the Trump campaign began?

A That is correct, sir.

Q I believe you testified to this, so I apologize if it's repetitive, but have you or anyone at Cambridge Analytica ever spoken or communicated with Julian Assange?

A Absolutely not. No one at my company nor myself has ever spoken or communicated with Julian Assange.

Q And have you or anyone at Cambridge Analytica ever communicated with any member of WikiLeaks, that you know of?

A That I know of? I certainly have not and, as far as I know, no one in my organization has communicated or spoken to anyone at WikiLeaks.

Q During your employment with the Trump campaign for Presidency, did any member of the Trump campaign ask you or Cambridge Analytica to obtain information from Russian Government officials for the campaign?

A Absolutely not.

Q Do you have any knowledge of any individuals associated with the Trump campaign, direct knowledge that is, had information or sought information from Russian Government officials during the election cycle?

A No, I do not.

Q Mr. Nix, one of the things the committee is looking at is the, you know, the effects of any sort of Russian involvement in the 2016 election cycle, so I'll encapsulate my questions under that umbrella for the following few.

Do you have any information, you or -- when I ask "you," I would assume you would understand that to mean you and Cambridge Analytica, as its representative -- that the Trump campaign or its officials colluded with anyone in the Russian Government to rig the 2016 Presidential election?

A No, I do not.

Q And do you, Mr. Nix or Cambridge Analytica, are you in the possession of any or aware of any information that the Trump campaign conspired or coordinated with the Russian Government or any Russian Government officials to rig or somehow, quote/unquote, steal the 2016 election?

A Absolutely not.

Q If any of that information were ever to come to light, just please let your counsel know, and we can engage with him to receive it.

A Of course.

Q Circling back to the emails, the WikiLeaks, quote/unquote, the emails that they have, I just want to clarify one point. We were talking about -- a lot about what your intention may or may not have been, but is it your testimony that it is impossible for you to formulate your intention on what to do with those emails without having first ever seen them?

A That is correct.

Q And why is that your testimony?

A Because, without understanding whether there was anything relevant in those emails to the election, it would be impossible for me to tell you what my intention was. It might have been the case that these emails were entirely benign and simply not worth taking any action about.

Q And at the time, did you or Cambridge Analytica have any actual information to know that Julian Assange and/or WikiLeaks had possession of these so-called emails?

A None whatsoever. And I don't think that we do -- we still don't have that information today, nor do you, I don't think -- I mean, nor does anyone is my point.

Q So, to the best of your recollection and your testimony here today, you, Mr. Nix or Cambridge Analytica, still cannot confirm whether WikiLeaks and Julian Assange is even in possession of the, quote/unquote, hacked emails?

[10:12 a.m.]

MR. NIX: Absolutely correct.

BY [REDACTED]

Q One moment.

A Just to color this in, this was -- it was a half conceived idea that I got from reading a newspaper that led to a single question, can you find out more information about this, find out if it's true, see if we can get ahold of those emails. The answer was no. We never thought about the matter again.

Q Thank you, sir. Can you just give me a moment?

A Sure.

[REDACTED] Sir, Mr. Ranking Member, we yield to you.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you. Mike.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sure. Hello again. So I'll ask you about a few more people if I could. Have you ever heard of Randy Credico?

MR. NIX: No, sir. I don't think --

MR. QUIGLEY: Oh, sorry. Just give us a second here, okay.
Have you ever heard of Randy Credico?

MR. NIX: No, sir. I've never heard of Randy Credico.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. This was the individual identified publicly as the intermediary between Roger Stone and Julian Assange. You never heard of him?

MR. NIX: I've never heard of him.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did anyone else that you communicated with in the Trump campaign refer in any way to anyone else that may have been in communication with WikiLeaks or Julian Assange?

MR. NIX: Absolutely not. I never heard Julian Assange's name

mentioned in the campaign ever.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did anyone in the Trump campaign ever talk to you about Hillary Clinton's emails?

MR. NIX: No, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: No one associated in any respect whatsoever with the Trump campaign ever talked to you about anything at all to do with Russia or the Hillary Clinton emails. Is that correct?

MR. NIX: That is absolutely correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Or any efforts to obtain those?

MR. NIX: No, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MS. SPEIER: Good morning. Good afternoon. I'm Jackie Speier, one of the members of the committee.

Could you tell me how many employees you have in the United States?

MR. NIX: In the U.S., we probably have approximately 45 to 50 employees.

MS. SPEIER: And where are they located?

MR. NIX: They're located between three offices, one office in New York, one in D.C., and one in Arlington.

MS. SPEIER: And were these employees engaged during the Trump campaign?

MR. NIX: Some of them were. Some of them have been hired since the Trump campaign. The Trump campaign team comprised some employees from the U.S. and some employees from our U.K. office.

MS. SPEIER: And of the ones that were employed in the United States,

what did they work on?

MR. NIX: So our role on the campaign was to provide a lot of in-depth quantitative research, to provide data analytics and predictive modeling, provide digital engagement, and optimize linear broadcast television engagement.

MS. SPEIER: So those are the kinds of functions that they perform?

MR. NIX: That's correct.

MS. SPEIER: And how many were in New York and how many in D.C. and how many in Arlington?

MR. NIX: Do you mean how many were working on the campaign --

MS. SPEIER: Yes, in each of those cities.

MR. NIX: -- from those locations?

MS. SPEIER: Uh-huh.

MR. NIX: So we had a team based in San Antonio at the offices of Brad Parscale, and we had some members based in Trump Tower, and then we had some of our team members were based out of D.C. and some out of London.

MS. SPEIER: So were you engaged in formulating the policy on Russia?

MR. NIX: Sorry. I can't begin to answer that question. Do you mean the campaign policy?

MR. NIX: Yes.

MR. NIX: No, we weren't.

MS. SPEIER: Were you asked to poll --

MR. NIX: I don't think -- the campaign didn't have a policy.

MS. SPEIER: Well, actually the President spoke out and gave a foreign policy speech in March of 2016 that was quite significant and talked about reengaging in Russia and developing a better relationship with Russia.

MR. NIX: My apologies, ma'am. This is a translation, a semantic issue. By policy, I understand what you mean is a campaign promise?

MS. SPEIER: Yes.

MR. NIX: We were not involved in that, no.

MS. SPEIER: Were you ever asked to poll Americans on their interest in a better relationship with Russia?

MR. NIX: I don't know, I'm afraid. To explain it to you, in the United States, there are strict laws that govern how you can engage within campaigns and whether or not you are inside or outside of what's known as a firewall, and because Cambridge Analytica was working on both the Trump campaign and also supporting a Super PAC that was supporting Trump, I was inside the firewall of the Super PAC and, therefore, was not inside the campaign firewall, so I would not be able to share with you any intimate day-to-day knowledge of the campaign in this inquiry.

MS. SPEIER: So were all your employees operating in the super-PAC?

MR. NIX: No. We had some employees who were working for the campaign and inside their firewall, and other employees were working for the super-PAC and inside their firewall. And not only do these employees have to be separate, but they can't communicate with each other about the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: But if I understand correctly, you did communicate with Mr. Parscale, correct?

MR. NIX: I only communicated with Mr. Parscale up until the point that we won the contract, and then my communications, thereafter, were limited to commercial discussions about increasing our mandate and taking on more work, which is totally legitimate.

It was a sales and marketing role that I performed in order to increase the scope of work for Cambridge Analytica.

MS. SPEIER: So who did you work with within the super-PAC?

MR. NIX: So the super-PAC was an independent expenditure that was set up to support the Trump campaign, and Cambridge Analytica undertook a significant role in providing the same or similar source of services to the super-PAC as we provided to the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So you would probably use the same analytics in the super-PAC as you might have been using in the campaign?

MR. NIX: No. We actually have to use different data, different analytics, different systems, different servers, different models, different team members, areas. It's a very serious firewall that prevents us from sharing personnel or know-how between the two entities.

MS. SPEIER: So who -- what was the name of the super-PAC?

MR. NIX: Make America Number One.

MS. SPEIER: Not Make America Great, huh?

MR. NIX: Was it Make America Great? I believe it was Make America Number One.

MS. SPEIER: So in terms of the amount of enumeration you received that we have, I guess, been able to determine over time, that may have only been for Cambridge Analytica on the campaign versus Cambridge Analytica on the super-PAC?

MR. NIX: I couldn't begin to answer that, as I don't know what information you have in front of you.

MS. SPEIER: So who was running the Make America Number One PAC?

MR. NIX: Make America Number One PAC was being run by a colleague called Emily Cornell.

MS. SPEIER: And how did you engage with her? I mean, do you know her personally and you appointed her, or how was this PAC created?

MR. NIX: Well, a PAC could be incorporated by anyone as far as I'm aware, but you'd probably be better speaking to the counsel behind you.

In this case, I believe the PAC was formed by lawyers, and it was then funded by donors, and Cambridge Analytica were asked to take on a significant role in managing and supporting the PAC.

MS. SPEIER: So who did you -- did you communicate with Emily Cornell in your work that you did for the PAC?

MR. NIX: Yes. I was involved quite heavily with the PAC, as I sat inside the PAC firewall.

MS. SPEIER: Can you tell us who she is, what she does?

MR. NIX: She was, or is, a former employee of Cambridge Analytica.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. So the PAC was created and the CEO or the founder of the PAC was Emily Cornell who worked at Cambridge Analytica?

MR. NIX: The PAC was created as an independent expenditure, and Cambridge Analytica were asked to take prominent roles in managing the PAC. One of those was held by Emily Cornell, who was the head of the PAC.

 Five minutes.

MS. SPEIER: So if I understand correctly, it was also known as Defeat Crooked Hillary PAC?

MR. NIX: The official name of the PAC was Make America Number One.

MS. SPEIER: Was it also known as Defeat Crooked Hillary?

MR. NIX: My understanding is that, for legal reasons, it could not be called Defeat Crooked Hillary because -- and, again, you'd have to seek counsel on this, but I believe there is something against using a candidate's name in the PAC.

MS. SPEIER: So Rebekah Mercer and Steve Bannon were an integral part of this PAC?

MR. NIX: Rebekah Mercer was involved in the PAC, but Steve Bannon was not.

MS. SPEIER: Is that because there was a firewall and he was working on the campaign?

MR. NIX: That is correct.

MS. SPEIER: And Rebekah Mercer then would pay Cambridge Analytica for the services that were rendered under this PAC?

MR. NIX: Rebekah Mercer would pay the -- or, sorry, Rebekah Mercer and any other donors to the PAC would pay the PAC, and the PAC would then engage the services of Cambridge Analytica.

MS. SPEIER: And were there other donors to the PAC?

MR. NIX: I'm afraid you'd have to check with FEC filings, ma'am. I can't recall that.

MS. SPEIER: Well, how much was in the PAC?

MR. NIX: Again, I believe that's a matter of public record, so you should be able to find that very easily.

MS. SPEIER: Well, we may be able to, but I'm curious, you must have created a budget to provide the services to the PAC. So what was your budget?

MR. NIX: Please understand, ma'am, I run the business of the business. I don't run and work on specific campaigns. So I was engaged with not just

working in the United States but on commercial business, government business, both in the U.S. and abroad, and so I would not necessarily have specific oversight of any one contract.

██████████ 1 minute, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Well, but you earlier said that you were engaged specifically in this PAC, correct?

MR. NIX: No -- yes, ma'am. I was inside the PAC firewall. I was trying to make the point that I was not inside the campaign firewall. But just because I'm inside the firewall, it doesn't mean that I am spending all my time working on that one project --

MS. SPEIER: So how --

MR. NIX: -- or campaign.

MS. SPEIER: If you were to assess how much of your time you spent on the Crooked Hillary PAC or Defeat Crooked Hillary or Make America Number One, how much time would you have spent during that May to November period of time?

MR. NIX: Fifteen percent.

██████████ That's time, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: Can I just ask one -- on this subject, Molly Schweikert, which wall was she within?

MR. NIX: The campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: And if I could ask counsel, votes are starting imminently, so we're going to have to go vote. What is your intention in terms of are we going to suspend until after votes? Are you going to continue during votes?

[REDACTED] We're happy to continue with staff as we've done in other interviews.

MR. QUIGLEY: Could I ask as a courtesy since we have to leave, if I could have --

[REDACTED] If you guys want to go, why don't you guys just go.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, what I'd like to do is ask like 5 more minutes of questions and then --

[REDACTED] What I was going to offer is, why don't you just take the time until you have to leave to ask questions.

MR. QUIGLEY: That's fine.

[REDACTED] You guys take it however you wish.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sir, I apologize for the jumping back and forth. We appreciate your understanding.

Sir, by the time this August 26 email had come out that we had just talked about, there was quite a bit of reporting that the D trip, the Democratic organization had been hacked, and that the cybersecurity firm, CrowdStrike, attributed that hack to the Russia. This was done publicly. Were you aware of those reports?

MR. NIX: If they were in the newspapers or in the public domain, it's possible that I was aware of them, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: And at that time, what would your feelings be about the D trip, DNC, or any other candidates' systems being hacked by the Russians?

MR. NIX: I can't recall whether the hack had been attributed to the Russians at that stage, or whether that information came out later.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, I believe the cybersecurity firm CrowdStrike had

made that public.

MR. NIX: I can't tell you how I felt towards that. It's --

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, did it or does it bother you to understand that these systems had been hacked?

MR. NIX: We work on elections all over the world, and we always work in free and fair democracies for mainstream political parties in order to try and help our candidates to communicate most effectively and most legally with their citizens.

The idea that any --

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, how did --

MR. NIX: -- that any election is hacked is clearly a front to that democracy and the democratic system generally. And therefore, that --

MR. QUIGLEY: Respectfully, sir, how did you think that WikiLeaks had obtained these emails?

MR. MUYSKENS: Would you mind doing us the courtesy of allowing my client to finish?

MR. QUIGLEY: I apologize. Please go ahead.

MR. MUYSKENS: Thank you.

MR. NIX: Sorry. I've lost my train of thought. But I'll answer your second question, which is, I've already made it clear to you that we heard about the WikiLeaks having Hillary's emails from the newspaper.

Yes, it is possible they could have been hacked. It's possible that one of her staffers or colleagues could have handed them over, you know. There are numbers of different ways that information can be passed around, and that's not always to suggest that it's done by a foreign state actor, you know, through a hack.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. QUIGLEY: And just to make sure you finish, is there anything else you wanted to answer?

MR. NIX: No, thank you, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Had you ever heard of the GOP operative Peter Smith?

MR. NIX: I've never heard of him, sir.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MS. SPEIER: Can you tell us about your relationship with Nigel Farage?

MR. NIX: I think I've met Nigel Farage twice only in my life, once was socially, and once I met him in London at a meeting.

MS. SPEIER: And what was this meeting about?

MR. NIX: This meeting was to explore whether there might be opportunities to undertake political work, largely in the U.K. and other European countries together, leveraging his relationships of the European parliament.

MS. SPEIER: So you did not introduce him to then-candidate Donald Trump?

MR. NIX: No. No, I did not.

MS. SPEIER: There's an email that appears to be from you, number 000019-22 that references -- have you found it?

MR. NIX: No, but do continue, ma'am.

MR. MUYSKENS: [REDACTED] were these in the front of that big stack you sent or -- they're not in any -- they're kind of in random Bates order, so it's a little hard for us to find the particular number.

MS. SPEIER: The number is 19-22, but it's a reference to your email in which you, I guess, are talking to Steve Bannon and indicating that it would cost

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the Trump campaign between \$650,000 and \$800,000 a month to have everyone at Cambridge Analytica on the campaign.

It's dated in August. So by then the PAC is created and the firewall is up, and you're having an email exchange with him about how much it was going to cost the campaign to have Cambridge Analytica provide services. Is that fair to say?

MR. NIX: Yes, ma'am, that's absolutely correct. So under the firewall regulations, I'm allowed to discuss with the campaign sales and commercial opportunities of which this was. It was an opportunity to up-sell or cross-sell our services.

The firewall is really to prohibit strategic knowledge about what the campaign is doing, i.e., what work it's working on, who it might be targeting, what its strategy or plan is with the super-PAC, to prevent the super-PAC from then putting PAC dollars behind a similar strategy.

So there's nothing to prevent me from speaking to Brad Parscale or Steve Bannon or any of the campaigns about pitching for more work.

MS. SPEIER: And unfortunately, we're going to have to leave to go vote at the Capitol. So I think we're going to continue this through staff, and hopefully we'll be back. So thank you very much.

[REDACTED] We can go off the record.

[Recess.]

[REDACTED] Thank you very much.

Mr. Nix, thanks again. Appreciate it. I don't have much more at all.

MR. MUYSKENS: Yeah, can I just -- do you mind if I ask a question or put something on the record?

[REDACTED] Sure.

MR. MUYSKENS: I do find it interesting that Cambridge Analytica is now getting calls from Reuters asking us whether we can confirm that there is a video conference going on at Greenberg Traurig with Alex Nix.

I would like to put on the record that I think this type of confidentiality, or lack thereof, is disgusting. It is not what we were promised, not what we assumed would happen. And I'm going to state that I really do object to you all taking this as, I guess, apparently not seriously at all. You know, this is confidential. This is important. You are the House Intel Committee. We respectfully ask you to try to keep some of this confidential and do your jobs.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] Thank you. We appreciate that.

EXAMINATION

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Nix, I just have a couple questions regarding -- as I said, I am not well versed in your universe, and there was a number of questions regarding being walled off from the super-PAC, which I forget the name of, Make America Number One Again.

A Number one.

Q Thank you. So if you were -- -- can you just give me a quick summary of what it means to be walled off in the super-PAC versus the campaign, and then your position vis-à-vis those two?

A So it's not possible to work on both the campaign and for a super-PAC at the same time. So any staffer to a campaign or a super-PAC has to work only for that entity. Actually, that's not entirely true. You can leave a super-PAC, I

believe, and go work for a campaign, but you can't work for a campaign and then work for a super-PAC without a cooling off period of 120 days.

Q Okay. That makes a lot of sense.

A And the idea behind this is that you can't leave the campaign and share the strategy of the campaign with the super-PAC, which obviously has unlimited funding potential, such that it can then implement that strategy with the -- with those unlimited dollars.

Q That makes a lot of sense.

And then your role, can you just give me a quick summary, you know, what side of the wall you were on? I couldn't -- it was a little hard for me to follow.

A So I was initially responsible for liaising between Cambridge Analytica and both the Trump campaign and the super-PAC in order to win the contract to support these entities.

But once we had won the contract to support the Trump campaign, I was no longer allowed to have any dialogue with anyone within the campaign firewall at a strategic level. The only discussions I was allowed to have, or were allowed to have, were at a commercial level to explore opportunities for developing the contract for services.

Q So is it fair to say before the entering of the contract by Cambridge Analytica and the Trump campaign, you, on behalf of Cambridge Analytica, were attempting to obtain a contract so you could execute your professional services on behalf of the Trump campaign?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q And you weren't participating in policy-level discussions or talking on a daily basis with Trump campaign staffers or high-level officials who were actually

running the day-to-day affairs of the campaign in regards to policy of all things Russia or anything else for that matter?

A That's absolutely correct, sir.

Q And then after the establishment of the contract, I imagine, and correct me if I'm wrong, but you and Cambridge Analytica, your services were limited to exactly what the contract outlined. And did that contract outline for you to engage with high-level Trump campaign officials on policy decisions, directives, and how that presidency would actually look or run?

A No, it did not. No.

Q And had you or anyone at Cambridge Analytica ever taken such a role as to inject your personal opinions through your professional capacity to influence the outcome of the presidential election in 2016 on behalf of Trump and his surrogates?

A No.

[REDACTED] That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. NIX: Thank you.

[REDACTED] Do we need to move the microphone?

[REDACTED] Oh, yes. There it is.

MR. MUYSKENS: Thank you.

EXAMINATION

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Nix, I just have a couple of follow-up questions. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm [REDACTED] with the minority staff. And then I'll turn it over to my colleague [REDACTED] and we'll probably both ask questions.

We were able to obtain a copy of the letter that we sent to you. Apparently

it was dated July 10, 2017. So I was just wondering, when you recall receiving the letter?

MR. MUYSKENS: I assume you're talking about the letter from you guys asking for him to -- what letter are you talking about?

██████████ It's a letter dated July 10, 2017, to Cambridge Analytica, to your Washington, D.C. office from the House Intelligence Committee requesting --

MR. MUYSKENS: Thank you.

BY ██████████

Q -- documents and interview.

A Obviously, I can't -- I can only speculate as to when I may have received it. But assuming that the process was efficient, I probably would have received it within a number of days of it being sent to Washington, D.C.

Q And this might be a question your counsel can respond to, but when did you first contact the committee?

A I didn't contact the committee.

Q Someone contacted the committee. Sorry?

MR. MUYSKENS: That was done -- if you wouldn't mind letting me answer, I would answer your question. Are you ready? I think we started -- after receiving it, we started negotiating with counsel to find a date that worked. I don't know when those dates were. And, again, I'm not the witness.

██████████ Who is the counsel that you spoke with?

MR. MUYSKENS: Are you seriously asking me this question in this setting?

██████████ I am.

MR. MUYSKENS: We tried to work it out.

[REDACTED] I haven't spoken with you, and I'm not aware of my colleagues in the minority that have spoken with you. So I'm curious to know how we even arranged to be here today.

MR. MUYSKENS: I would imagine it was through [REDACTED] I would assume. I think he's the only one that ever contacted me about this, but, again, I'm not the witness.

[REDACTED] Is that right, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yeah, we're not here to ask me questions or him. If you have questions for the witness, we're fine to stay. Otherwise, we can --

[REDACTED] I'm asking you if you are the one who arranged the interview.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] I'm not a witness to your inquiry. Ask the witness questions, or we can conclude the interview.

[REDACTED] So you don't know the answer to that?

[REDACTED] Are you done with your inquiry of the witness?

[REDACTED] I'm trying to establish when the witness received the letter since the minority hasn't been a part of the process.

[REDACTED] Then ask the witness when he received the letter, and produce a copy of that letter to the witness so he can look at it and we can be professional and continue this inquiry.

[REDACTED] We sent the witness a letter on July 10, 2017.

[REDACTED] Has he seen it?

MR. MUYSKENS: Where is it addressed? Is it to me at Greenberg Traurig, or who is it addressed to?

[REDACTED] It's actually addressed to Cambridge Analytica, to your

Washington, D.C. office.

MR. MUYSKENS: Well, when you say "your," could you pronounce correctly -- you mean Cambridge Analytica's Washington office or Greenberg Traurig's?

██████████ Cambridge Analytica.

MR. MUYSKENS: So knowing that Mr. Nix was represented by counsel, you still reached out to Cambridge Analytica instead of reaching out through counsel?

██████████ I did not know that he was represented by counsel. I didn't know who counsel was for Cambridge Analytica. And it would have been the majority that --

MR. MUYSKENS: We can talk -- again, I'd prefer you to give -- may I speak? Do you mind? We did speak when we were making our earlier productions from Cambridge Analytica to the committee. I think the emails would show that you and I did talk, so you did know that Mr. Nix was representing Cambridge Analytica.

██████████ You know what --

MR. MUYSKENS: So what I would like to ask is, in the future, could you abide by the D.C. bar ethics rule and the various other legal rules we have and contact Cambridge Analytica through counsel as you're supposed to do. If you could do that, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

BY ██████████

Q Mr. Nix, when you met with Jared Kushner on June 9, 2016, do you recall what time that meeting occurred?

A No, I do not recall. During the day.

Q Is it possible you have a calendar or a schedule that might reflect the time of that meeting?

A Yes, it's possible.

Q Would you mind giving the -- providing the committee with a copy of that?

A What was the date of that meeting?

MR. MUYSKENS: We will talk about it after, and we'll provide you what we can.

BY [REDACTED]

Q The reason I ask is there was a meeting later that afternoon that has become fairly well known involving Mr. Kushner with a Russian Government lawyer. And I'm curious to know if Mr. Kushner mentioned that he had a meeting in which he might obtain dirt on Hillary Clinton?

A Could you repeat to me, please, the date of the meeting that you indicated?

Q June 9, 2016.

A Oh. Thank you.

Q Mr. Nix, over the course of the U.S. presidential election last year, a number of individuals reportedly sought to find and authenticate 30,000 to 33,000 emails that were allegedly deleted by Hillary Clinton. One gentleman, named Peter Smith, apparently spearheaded one of the operations. Did you ever interact with a gentleman named Peter Smith?

A No, I did not, as I mentioned earlier to your colleague.

Q Did you meet anyone who expressed interest in finding Hillary Clinton's missing 33,000 emails?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Outside of the discussions that we've had, no, I did not.

Q Are you aware of any activities on the dark web to seek information about Hillary Clinton?

A No, I'm not.

Q Have you ever met or do you know a gentleman named Chuck Johnson?

A No.

Q And I'm not assuming that you do. These are just individuals allegedly involved in this operation, so that's why I'm asking.

A I've never heard that name.

Q Mr. Nix, during the 2016 U.S. election cycle, how many countries did you travel to during that time, and which countries?

A I don't know, ma'am. I could speculate that I may have traveled to a dozen countries, predominantly between the U.K. and the U.S. and Europe, I would have thought.

Q How many times did you travel to the U.S. during the election cycle?

A I can't answer that question right now. I'm -- but I could speculate maybe -- the U.S. election cycle, meaning the nomination campaign or meaning the presidential campaign?

Q I say June 2015 through November 2016.

A Twenty, twenty-five.

Q Did you travel to the Ukraine during that time?

A No, I did not.

Q Did you travel to Russia during that time?

A No, I did not.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q To your knowledge, did any Cambridge Analytica employees travel to Russia between June 2015 and November 2016?

A To my knowledge, none of my employees did. Certainly none of them traveled there as part of their employment.

Q I'm sure you've seen some of the public reporting about the social media operations conducted out of Saint Petersburg, Russia, the troll farm there. To your knowledge, did Cambridge Analytica or any subsidiary or associate of Cambridge Analytica interact with anyone in Saint Petersburg?

A To my knowledge, no, we did not.

Q What year was Cambridge Analytica created?

A I believe the company was formally incorporated in 2013.

Q What were the circumstances under which it was incorporated? Why was it created?

A We wanted to establish a U.S. vehicle to address the political market in 2014.

Q Are the Mercers the sole funders of Cambridge?

A Cambridge Analytica is a private company, and we don't disclose information on our shareholders or board members.

Q Who heads the SCL Group, Limited?

A Could you define "has" please?

Q Who heads? Who is the leader?

A Oh, heads. Sorry, I beg your pardon. So SCL Group technically is run by myself, or headed by myself.

██████████ Five minutes.

BY ██████████

Q And is that also owned by the Mercers?

A I haven't provided a comment on the ownership of Cambridge Analytica, and I'm -- neither am I going to provide a comment on the ownership of SCL for the same reason.

Q What role does Nigel Oaks have in the SCL Group?

A Nigel Oaks runs a division within SCL Group active in the government space.

Q What part of the government space?

A The SCL Group was set up to support western governments, predominantly yours and mine, with something called "soft power." We work closely with your Department of Defense and mine and with your intelligence agencies to provide them with training and operational capabilities in the field of psychological operations.

We do this to try and help address very critical problems that counter terrorism, counter radicalization, counter narcotics, and programs of health, development, and welfare all over the world.

Q Would it be fair to say that individuals -- some individuals that work for SCL Group would have security clearances then?

A That's correct. Many of the individuals have a security clearance, either in the U.K. or top secret clearance in the U.S. or some, both.

Q Are you aware of anyone tied to the Russian Government or of Russian or Ukrainian descent who holds a minority or majority stake in SCL Group, Limited?

A I -- as far as I'm aware, there is no one that fits that profile that is a shareholder in SCL Group, Limited.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q What about Cambridge Analytica?

A Nor in Cambridge Analytica. I can confirm that the shareholders of Cambridge Analytica and the shareholders of SCL Group are all either British citizens or American citizens, as far as I'm aware.

[REDACTED] One minute.

BY [REDACTED]

Q If you learned that some of the stakeholders were tied to Russian leadership, would that concern you?

A It depends what the nature of that relationship was.

Q Does Cambridge Analytica or SCL Group have a particular political position?

A Absolutely not. Cambridge Analytica is a tech company. We do not take an ideological stance. We could have easily worked for the Democrats as we could have worked for the Republicans, and indeed, on the seven or eight elections that we undertake every year, as many of them are left of center as they are right of center.

[REDACTED] That's time.

[REDACTED] Turn it over to my colleagues.

[REDACTED] Thanks, Mr. Nix, on behalf of the majority, and we don't have anymore questions for you. We appreciate your time.

Yield back to the minority.

MR. NIX: Thank you.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Nix, where is Cambridge Analytica's U.S. person voter and consumer data housed?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A That's a very good question. I'm going to have to get back to you on that because I believe different data sets are housed in different locations depending on specific State legislation. But our data is housed in the cloud, and the control of that data resides in the relevant jurisdictions from where we operate.

Q Okay. So would you mind getting back to us on where it's actually housed?

MR. MUYSKENS: We will take all of your requests and we'll review them. Maybe it makes sense at the end of this, when you've reviewed the transcript, to put together a list of things you've requested throughout the -- throughout this interview, if you don't mind.

██████████ Happy to do that.

MR. MUYSKENS: Sure.

██████████ Do you know whether U.S. person data sets or files are kept separate and apart from non-U.S. person data file and sets?

MR. MUYSKENS: Could I suggest that before you ask questions like that, that you don't assume these things exist, or at least don't assume that they exist in the terminology you're using.

Because I think one reason you guys are having a slight bit of trouble communicating is, you know, we need to -- I don't really know what a personal data set is. You see what I'm saying? It may be called something else. Thank you.

██████████ It's entirely possible that I am calling it the entirely wrong name, so if you could maybe help me understand what I'm trying to ask. I'm not a tech person, so --

MR. MUYSKENS: Yeah. And in the law, we refer to that as asking

questions with absolutely no foundation. So maybe just if you could -- it would be helpful to everybody to have a clear transcript, if you could, you know, establish that we are all on the same page of terminology.

██████████ We're not --

MR. MUYSKENS: Now, that's abundantly clear this is not a legal setting, but I'm just suggesting it might make this more efficient.

BY ██████████

Q Mr. Nix, do you keep U.S. person information separate from non-U.S. person information?

A We don't have the same data on non-U.S. persons as we do on U.S. persons. Different territories have different legislations, and different legislation governs what sort of data you can hold, and how it needs to be held. So for every territory that we operate in, we have to abide by the local legislation in terms of how we collect and maintain our data sets.

Q On the Cambridge Analytica website, there's a reference to up to 5,000 data points on over 230 million American voters. How did Cambridge Analytica build up to that?

A These data are commercially available in the United States. The legislative environment is such that companies such as Cambridge Analytica are able to license or acquire these data from large and small data vendors and data aggregators. In addition, we undertake material amounts of first-party research to augment these data files that we are able to buy or license commercially.

Q Has Cambridge Analytica acquired bulk data through Facebook?

A No, it has not.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica purchase Facebook ads during the election

cycle?

A Cambridge Analytica purchased Facebook ads on behalf of Trump campaign and on behalf of the super-PACs for the election campaign.

Q Do you know approximately how much money Cambridge Analytica spent purchasing ads on Facebook?

A For the Trump campaign we spent a little shy of \$100 million. For the super-PAC, I would have -- I don't know the answer.

Q Mr. Nix, in a series of emails dated from May 27 to 28, 2016, between yourself, Alex Taylor, and SCL Group chairman Julian Wheatland, and that's Cambridge Analytica Bates numbers 1569 through 1571. It should be in the middle of the production we provided you.

MR. MUYSKENS: What was the first number? 1569?

[REDACTED] Yes.

MR. MUYSKENS: Thank you. Got it.

BY [REDACTED]

Q You three are discussing the implications of assigning Cambridge Analytica staff to the Trump campaign absent a contract.

A Uh-huh.

Q Mr. Taylor wrote on May 27, quote, "By putting people in the campaign without a contract in place, we are incentivizing the campaign to put off ever paying us. At some point, they will be weighing how much value is left for us to create, especially if we've already handed over data versus the value in not having to pay the bill we have run up."

MR. MUYSKENS: Did somebody hit a button there? Because we just lost you guys from video. Weird. Can you see us?

[REDACTED] Yeah.

MR. MUYSKENS: We can't see anything. Hmm. I guess it doesn't really matter, but -- I'll let you go on, [REDACTED] I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you with a technical issue.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Nix, you reapplied later that same day, quote, "Rebekah has agreed to underwrite this piece of work. If we have not signed a contract within a couple of weeks, we will pull out."

I'm assuming Rebekah is Rebekah Mercer?

A I would assume so, given the context.

Q Mr. Taylor, on that same page responds, "I am not sure RM can underwrite the deal as you suggest due to FEC regulations. For her to pick up the tab would be an in-kind donation, and a couple of weeks of work at fair market value would certainly exceed her donation cap, assuming she hasn't already donated cash," end quote.

Mr. Taylor goes onto lay out a few upsides and many downsides to the approach. And then on May 28, that's Bates 1569, Mr. Wheatland replied, quote, "If she underwrites the cost, this never needs to be visible. If there's an FEC issue, it's an issue for the campaign as well as us, so they'll have to ask us to leave if they are not going to pay. There's nothing to lose and it's a superb commercial move to get in the door at zero risk," end quote.

After Mr. Taylor expresses a few more concerns, you reply at the end, quote, "For the last time, enough. This decision is made. I am convinced they will try and fuck us ever we do, and the upside of being part of the campaign far outweighs the issue you referenced," end quote.

Based on this email, it appears there was a willingness to at least partially skirt FEC regulations in order to get integrated with the Trump campaign. Why was that?

[11:28 a.m.]

MR. MUYSKENS: Like, why was what?

██████████ Why were you willing to skirt some FEC regulations in order to --

MR. MUYSKENS: You know --

MR. NIX: That's not how it reads to me. What it reads to me is that we were looking at or we were exploring engaging with the campaign and we were weighing the commercial pros and cons and the legal pros and cons.

And I think if you read Alex Taylor's email that said, "Anyway, we certainly need to check with Larry before sending anyone out there," Larry is our counsel. He is our FEC lawyer, who now actually works for Greenberg Traurig. And that's exactly what we did do and did do for every decision that's involved with the campaign, was to run it past counsel and get their opinions.

So this internal memo, which is an evaluation of the commercial and legal ramifications and options available to us, is no more than us speculating in the absence of the legal advice, which we then sought.

BY ██████████

Q The SCL chairman, Mr. Wheatland, if you recall, in the email said, quote: "If she" -- "she" presumably is Ms. Mercer -- "underwrites the cost, this never needs to be visible."

A So that's a statement of fact. But it doesn't imply an intention, nor does it imply an action.

Q Had SCL Group or Cambridge Analytica conducted similar campaign or political work in the past similar to what you did with the Trump campaign?

A I'm sorry, ma'am, I didn't understand the question. Do you mean had

we worked for a Republican Presidential candidate, or did you mean had we worked on an election campaign?

Q Mr. Nix, I'd like to turn to a June 8th, 2016, email, Cambridge Analytica Bates number 1640, to Mr. Parscale, copying Mr. Oczkowski. And I probably just mispronounced that name. The topic was, quote, "CA next steps," end quote.

And it included: CA, Cambridge Analytica, will send a team to San Antonio to start work on Monday, together with providing support services from London and D.C.

Monday would've been June 13th, 2016.

Do you recall how many employees you sent to San Antonio?

A I do not recall that, I'm afraid.

Q Is that a piece of information we could obtain?

MR. MUYSKENS: You know, again, put it in your list, and we'll review it.

Sorry. We're trying to figure out the camera issue here, so bear with us for 2 seconds.

[REDACTED] Sure.

MR. MUYSKENS: I'm sorry about that, [REDACTED] We're just having technical difficulties, but please continue.

Feel free to continue.

You guys there?

[REDACTED] We are.

BY [REDACTED]

Q And understanding, Mr. Nix, that you were sort of firewalled into the PAC and not the campaign, do you have an appreciation for the level of independence with which Cambridge Analytica operated with the campaign?

A I don't understand the question. Do you think you might be able to rephrase that, please?

Q Do you have a sense for the level of independence or autonomy in your operations during the campaign for the Trump campaign?

MR. MUYSKENS: I think we're having trouble with what you mean by "level of autonomy" in this context. It's not making sense. Sorry. We're not trying to be difficult.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Who was the head of the Cambridge Analytica team that worked on the Trump campaign side of the house? Because it sounds like you were firewalled off on the PAC.

A That is correct. So, as I mentioned to your colleague earlier, the senior staff members representing Cambridge Analytica's involvement with the campaign were Matt Oczkowski and Molly Schweickert.

Q I wonder if they might be the individuals that would be more helpful to our questions, actually.

A I can't speculate on that, because I don't know what questions you intend to ask.

Q They're campaign-related questions, not PAC-related.

A Well, if they're to do with the specific day-to-day activities of the campaign, then it's very unlikely that I will be able to answer them, as I was neither based in the campaign's offices in San Antonio nor in New York, and nor did I have access to or information of the daily activities of the campaign.

Q That's helpful. We may save some of those questions for those individuals.

Do you know the role of the folks that were embedded in San Antonio? Do you know what role they played?

A Yes, I do.

Q Can you tell us what their role was?

A Certainly I can. I just remind you, I have just told you this. The individuals were providing quantitative research, data analytics and predictive modeling, digital marketing, and optimizing the broadcast television advertising.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica have access to RNC data during the campaign?

A Yes, it did.

Q Did it have access to data gathered by the Trump team?

A I don't know the answer to that question. And I don't know how much data the Trump -- the campaign team gathered.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica also bring its own data to the Trump campaign?

A Initially, yes, but as the campaign developed, we started to use more data from the RNC.

Q What was different about the RNC data compared to yours?

A The RNC data has more political data attached to it, as they have data from other campaigns around the country which are then -- the RNC manages a data exchange called the Data Trust, which basically provides campaigns, Republican campaigns, with data. In exchange for giving access to these data, the campaigns are encouraged to update the data files or voter files with any additional information that they've been able to collect during their campaign.

Q Is that something you had to pay for, or was that provided -- I guess,

was that provided as a courtesy due to your relationship with the campaign?

A Well, the RNC provides these data to the campaign. And, obviously, we were engaging with these data in our capacity as service providers to the campaign. So they weren't giving these data to Cambridge; they were giving them to the campaign. And we were working on them on behalf of the campaign.

Q Would it be fair to say that, for example, Cambridge Analytica no longer has access to that data?

A Yes, it would.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica use any other third-party data that was not purchased?

A As far as I'm aware, it did not.

Q Understanding you utilized RNC data, was the RNC able to utilize your data as well?

A Well, the RNC doesn't have a data analytics capability that I'm aware of, certainly not one that would be able to perform the sort of analytics that Cambridge Analytica undertakes.

Q But in terms of the voter data, was there any sort of swapping of data, sharing of data?

A Not as far as I'm aware of.

Q Did you or anyone affiliated with the campaign, to your knowledge, ever share voter information with anyone affiliated with a foreign government?

A Absolutely not.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica have access to voter files?

A Yes, we have access to voter files. Any commercial entity can license a voter file or purchase a voter file in the United States.

Q What type of data did Cambridge Analytica use to target voters for online ads?

A Well, we used a combination of our own datasets, and then, as I've mentioned just now, we then started to -- as the RNC were engaged by the campaign, we started to use their data.

We augmented these data with first-party research. We were undertaking some 350- to 400,000 quantitative instruments every month.

Q And excuse me for my ignorance. Could you explain really simply what a dataset is?

A A dataset is a set of data.

Q Any set of data?

A Any set of data. That's my understanding of the meaning of the words.

Q Did you have datasets used to target individuals by gender for your advertising?

A It's possible that demographic segmentation would have been a part of our targeting. It is unlikely that we would have built a model based on one data point.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica have datasets used to target individuals by geography?

A Yes, geography would have been one of the many hundreds of data points that we might have had on any of the individuals that we were targeting.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica use datasets to target by race?

A It's very possible that ethnicity or race would have been one of the data points that we've been able to collect on individuals in the United States.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica use datasets to target based on different personalities?

A No, Cambridge Analytica did not use psychographic data in the Trump campaign.

Q Could you explain what psychographic data is?

A Data that's based on personality.

Q What types of personality characteristics are typical of psychographic data?

A Psychographic data seeks to measure the underlying, core personality traits that define identities.

Q What type of personality traits?

A Depending on which methodology you employ, you can quantify personality by a number of different types of metrics. At Cambridge, we use a broad spectrum of different methodologies from the fields of psychology and experimental psychology to understand personality.

Q So could you give us an example of a specific personality trait that would be tracked?

A Neuroticism.

Q And how would you determine that someone has that quality?

A If an individual responds to or fills out a quantitative instrument that seeks to probe these underlying personality traits, it's then possible to score their answers and to assign different personality traits to an individual.

Q This may be difficult to quantify in a short number of words, but are there a top four or five personality traits that would typically be used to conduct psychographic targeting?

A No. It's more complex than that.

Q So is it fair to say -- you mentioned earlier that the RNC didn't have the capability to conduct analytics. Would you take their data and then apply your analytics to that information?

A We would apply our methodology. Analytics isn't a product; it's a skill set or a service. So we could perform data analytics on their data. It's not that we would append or attach analytics to their data.

Q Right. And did you perform analytics on their data?

A Yes, we did.

Q What type of analytics did you perform on the RNC data?

A We undertook predictive modeling to try and understand which voters in the United States were likely to support Trump as opposed to Hillary or any other candidate, what their ideologies might be. We tried to understand what issues people cared about. We tried to understand who was likely to want to donate or volunteer to support a campaign. We tried to understand who was likely to turn out and vote or not. These sorts of things.

Q Now, if you identified a group of folks who might be inclined not to turn out and vote, did you then target that group to encourage them not to go vote?

A Sorry, could I just repeat your question? You said, if we'd identified a group of voters who were not likely to vote, did we then target them to encourage them not to vote. Is that what you said?

Q I can probably say that more clearly.

Did Cambridge Analytica, in conducting analytics on the RNC data, discover information about a group who might be inclined not to vote and then target those voters to encourage them not to vote?

MR. MUYSKENS: Can I give this a shot?

[REDACTED] Sure.

MR. MUYSKENS: When you found a group of voters who were not likely to vote, what would you do next?

Is that all right?

[REDACTED] Sure.

MR. NIX: Well, I guess it would depend whether we had determined whether those voters were likely Democrats or likely Republicans. If they were likely Republicans, we would probably encourage them to vote, because that would be in the best interests of our client.

BY [REDACTED]

Q And if they were more inclined to the Democrats, how would you target them to encourage them not to vote?

A Well, you're assuming that we would encourage them not to vote, and I haven't suggested that we would. Our focus in this election in the Trump campaign, bearing in mind I was not inside the firewall, was a pro-Trump campaign. It was to try and identify as many Trump supporters as we could and to encourage all and every one of them to turn out and vote. That was the objective of the Trump campaign.

Q Did Cambridge --

A We --

Q Sorry.

A Carry on.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica at any time during the campaign use your datasets to suppress voter turnout?

A No, we did not.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica have access to Trump campaign servers during the election?

A I don't know the answer to that question. It's too precise. And not being in the firewall, I wouldn't necessarily know that information.

Q What was Cambridge Analytica's relationship with Project Alamo?

A Again, I'm speculating, but I think Project Alamo was the name given to the operation based in Texas.

Q That is correct. Did Cambridge Analytica employees have access to the Project Alamo data?

MR. MUYSKENS: Access to what?

██████████ To Project Alamo information.

MR. NIX: Again, I'm not sure I can answer that. And I was not aware and I'm still not aware whether the campaign had any data of its own or what that data was. When we arrived on the campaign, there had been no investment into IT infrastructure or support and no investment into data or analytics, which was why Cambridge was given such a prominent role on the campaign.

BY ██████████

Q Does Cambridge Analytica maintain its own servers, or do you use larger networks?

A We have our own servers, but the majority of our data is housed in a cloud.

Q Where was the U.S. person data housed?

A Different datasets reside in different territories, depending on the legislation in those specific territories. So my understanding is, while the data can

be housed in the cloud, where that data is controlled from is dictated by the legislation territory by territory or, in the case of the U.S., sometimes State by State.

Q And I think we spoke about this earlier. Do you know if the servers are in the U.S., are they in the U.K., or some other country?

A No, the data is stored in a cloud. So, obviously -- oh, do you mean where the cloud servers are?

Q Right.

A I don't know, but I'm assuming that they're in the United States. I wouldn't be able to answer that without checking.

Q Did the Trump campaign employees have access to Cambridge Analytica servers or the cloud?

A Not as far as I'm aware. In fact, I'm going to go further than that: No.

Q Does Cambridge Analytica ever make its data available to third parties?

A We have historically entered into data-sharing or data-reciprocity agreements, where we will make some of our data available in exchange for other parties' data. So the answer is yes. But, as a rule, our data is ours, and our clients like to retain their data. But often we share in mobile derivatives.

Q But I think if I'm understanding you correctly, you did not do that with the Trump campaign?

A Well, I'm not sure what data the Trump campaign had that you're referring to, again, largely because I don't think they had much data before we joined the campaign and also because I wasn't inside the firewall.

Q Did you ever post voter data or other campaign data online?

A Absolutely not. And nor would we. Why would we make publicly available an asset of the company?

Q After the campaign concluded, did Cambridge Analytica end up in a position where it had more data than before the engagement, less data, or the same?

A Well, I assume that, as a result of the data-driven campaigns that we run -- ran -- sorry -- that Cambridge Analytica's data would have increased. Because from every campaign that we run, we're able to get some feedback from that campaign, and then that can be then incorporated into our overall dataset.

Q Does Cambridge Analytica's parent company, SCL Group Limited, based in London, have access to U.S. voter data?

A You're making an assumption that SCL Group is the parent company of Cambridge Analytica, and I have not confirmed nor denied that. So that's why I think it would be wrong to assume that.

Q Well, let me ask you then, is SCL Group the parent company of Cambridge Analytica?

A SCL Group and Cambridge Analytica are private companies, and their relationship is not a matter of public record.

Q Does that mean you're not willing to answer the question?

A It means they're private companies and the shareholders, directors of these individuals and their relationship to one another is not a matter for public record.

Q Does SCL Group have access to U.S. voter data?

A Not that I'm aware of. But if the question is could a U.K. company have access to U.S. voter data, the answer is yes. You don't need to be an

American company to license a U.S. voter file.

Q Mr. Nix, did you or anyone, to your knowledge, ever share targeting information outside of the campaign?

A No, we did not.

Q How common would it be for political campaign professionals such as yourself to leave data, photos, videos, or other campaign material online for others to access or use?

A Not at all common. This would never happen in an organization like Cambridge Analytica.

Q Are you aware of reports that The Trump Organization maintained a data link with a Russian-based bank, Alpha Bank, during the election?

A No, I'm absolutely not aware of those reports.

Q Did you ever hear any Trump campaign officials discuss Alpha Bank?

A I've never heard the name "Alpha Bank" before this discussion with you.

Q This may be a bit tactical for you to answer. Brad Parscale has said publicly that his data operation, quote, "ran everything" for the campaign -- television buys, get out the vote, ground operations. Is that your understanding as well?

A Brad was appointed head of the digital and data organization for the campaign by the Trump team, but Brad himself is not a data scientist nor a digital or data-driven digital or data-driven television professional. And, therefore, his role was to liaise between the campaign hierarchy and the service providers who had been brought in to undertake all that work. And those service providers were Cambridge Analytica.

Q So Cambridge Analytica provided the scientific professionals to sort of run the data operations. Is that fair to say?

A That's entirely fair to say. Brad Parscale's company in Texas is a specialist in branding and logo design. I think they do some interior design, and I think they make some websites. They have no data or IT or technical capability such as that which was employed on the campaign by Cambridge Analytica.

Q So, given that really it sounds like you provided the, sort of, more sophisticated technical expertise to the campaign, did you have a fair amount of autonomy? Or would you go through Mr. Parscale to get approval for --

A I can't answer that question. That would be too specific. Obviously, we could have had those discussions since the election, but I haven't been -- had those discussions with my colleagues.

Q And that may be for someone else to answer, whether you had autonomy to direct ads or buy ads or make ads. That's the question I'm trying to get at.

A Again, I don't know the answer to that, ma'am. I'm not trying to be difficult here. I just wasn't there during the campaign.

Q Mr. Parscale has said that Project Alamo produced thousands of variations of ads in order to tailor them to specific voter preferences. Would that be something that Cambridge Analytica actually did?

A So the split of work was that Cambridge Analytica did the data analytics to identify target audiences, and we then helped Brad's team to understand what the messages should be, which issues were most relevant, what the ideologies of the audiences were, what the demographics, geographics, and so forth of the audiences were.

And then Brad's team, which is a graphic design team -- they're a creative team that have a background and professionalism in making the images and the words. So they would make the pictures and the messages that were then sent out by digital. So they would then give us those messages, and then we would then place that advertising for them, digitally target the audiences that we'd identified.

Q So it sounds like you would make recommendations to Mr. Parscale based on your analytics.

I'm just trying to understand how this process worked.

A Yes, that's how it typically works with our clients, both in the political and in the commercial sectors, is that we are able to use the data to drive insights. These insights are then used to drive the creative messaging. And then the data is then used again to drive the targeting of those messages through different channels.

Q And would Mr. Parscale, then, be basically the decisionmaker for your recommendations?

A Again, I really wasn't in Texas during the election. I don't know how the day-to-day management worked. But I know that Mr. Parscale spent a lot of time out of the office in New York, so I don't know how that was managed.

Q Understood.

Do you know whether Cambridge Analytica picked vendors or subcontractors to join the campaign?

A I don't know the answer to that question.

Q Mr. Nix, did Cambridge Analytica engage in or provide the campaign guidance on microtargeting of particular ads?

A Sorry. I clearly haven't been clear in what I've been explaining to you. Microtargeting is a collective terminology to describe everything that I've been trying to explain to you -- using data to target very small groups, i.e., microtargets --

Q Right.

A -- with very personalized, individualized information and communications.

Q And did you provide -- so, earlier, you said that you provided, sort of, broad guidelines. So I would think microtargeting would be very specific targeting. What type of specific targeting did you conduct on Facebook and Twitter?

A Well, the objective of microtargeting is to try and cluster audiences into as small of groups as possible where the constituents of those groups have the same or similar underlying demographics, geographic, economics, media consumption, issue preference, ideology, or any other factor, such that you can serve them one particular message that's going to resonate with the majority of the group that you're seeking to engage.

It is in contrast to what you might consider blanket advertising, where hundreds of thousands or millions of people receive a message for which only some -- for whom only some it is relevant.

Q How involved were you in the Facebook ad-buying for the campaign? Is that something your colleagues would know about who were actually involved?

A Well, personally, I was not involved at all, because I wasn't inside the campaign firewall. But my colleagues in Texas were responsible for purchasing all the advertising on Facebook and other platforms for the campaign.

Q I have a feeling they would probably be the better person to ask a number of the questions we have. And I'm assuming they didn't tell you about their Facebook buying or their Twitter purchases. Is that correct?

A Not in the level of detail that you're suggesting that you might want to pursue.

Q Do you know if you used a company called Sprinkler during the campaign?

A I've never heard of that company before.

Q Did the Trump campaign, via Cambridge, purchase Twitter ads? And do you know how much was spent on the Twitter ads if you did purchase them?

A I don't know the answer to either of those questions.

Q Understanding that Mr. Parscale's group did some web designing and content, did Cambridge Analytica have any responsibility for web content on the campaign?

A I don't think so, but I can't answer with total certainty on that.

Q Do you know whether Cambridge Analytica created YouTube videos for the campaign?

A I can't answer with any conviction on that either. I don't know. I just don't know.

Q A senior Trump campaign official said that the Trump campaign was engaged in efforts to suppress the vote among, quote, "idealistic white liberals, young women, and African Americans," end quote. Some of that targeting was delivered through Facebook dark posts, which were nonpublic posts whose viewership the campaign controlled so that, as Mr. Parscale puts it, "only the people we want to see see it."

Was Cambridge Analytica involved in this aspect of Mr. Parscale's campaign?

A As far as I'm aware, we had absolutely no involvement in that.

Q Are you aware of allegations that the Trump campaign was involved in voter suppression efforts?

A No, I'm not aware at all.

Q Did Cambridge Analytica share or utilize any of the emails released by WikiLeaks during the campaign?

A No, we did not. And I'm not even sure -- are we talking about the emails that we were talking about earlier that possibly have not yet still been released, or are we talking about some other emails?

Q Well --

A By the way, the answer is no. I mean --

Q Just before the Democratic National Convention, around 20,000 emails were released by WikiLeaks. And I believe that was the initial large dump of emails, and that was followed by a series of releases up to the election.

A No, we weren't.

Q Have you heard of DCLeaks.com?

A No, I haven't.

Q Have you heard of Guccifer 2.0?

A No, I haven't.

Q You've never heard that word?

A "Lucifer 2.0"?

Q "Guccifer" with a "G."

A Oh. No, I've never heard of that either. Sorry. Never heard of it

before, ever.

Q How is the PAC that you were involved with -- how is the PAC's digital strategy distinct from the campaign's?

A Well, the PAC had a slightly different emphasis. As is implied by its pseudo title, "Defeat Crooked Hillary," the purpose of the PAC was to bring to attention some of the perceived failings of the candidate, as opposed to to amplify some of the strengths of President Trump.

Q Did you or anyone that you're aware of in the PAC ever share or target, release information that you knew to be false?

A No, we did not.

Q Did you share your targeting or microtargeting details with the Trump campaign?

A Of course we didn't.

Q Did you share it with anyone outside the PAC?

A No.

Q Was Mr. Bannon ever affiliated with the PAC?

A No, he was not.

Q And where did the PAC obtain its data? Was it the same data the campaign was using, just with different analytics?

A It would have been possibly based on similar datasets, but different datasets.

Q But the actual data came from where?

A Well, it came from a large number of different sources. So, for instance, for the campaign, as I mentioned, we were undertaking tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of quantitative surveys every month,

and for the super PAC, we were undertaking a separate program of quantitative research. So, whilst we were collecting similar data, they were different data.

Q That's helpful, actually.

Did the PAC also buy ads on social media?

A Yes, it did.

Q Which social media platforms did the PAC use?

A So, as a company, we are platform-agnostic. So we will choose whichever platform has the highest density of the target audience that we're seeking to engage with, using it or interfacing with it. Typically, Facebook and Google tend to be very representative, but as we target more niche groups, we'll likely use different platforms. These could be news platforms. They would be other social media platforms. They could be, you know, content-based websites or e-commerce websites or anything else.

Q Do you know if the PAC used Twitter?

A I don't, actually. I don't know that it did. I can't remember any specific Twitter campaigns. But, again, I'm not really in the weeds of the day-to-day operations of the PAC.

Q Were you part of the decisionmaking in terms of purchases of social media ads?

A Well, I would consider that to be an in-the-weeds, a tactical-level decision. I was more involved at a strategic level.

Q So what types of decisions would you have been a part of?

A Understanding what issues and what direction the PAC should pursue; allocation of PAC resources between, say, television and digital; you know, high-level strategic decisions. Certainly not tactical decisions about specific

adverts and where to place them.

Q Does the PAC still exist?

A I believe it does.

Q Did it have its own email address?

A I believe it did not. I know it did not. Sorry.

Q But what email address did you use for your communications?

A Between whom?

Q In your role with the PAC.

A My Cambridge Analytica email.

Q Did you use any other email accounts?

A Not knowingly. I had no need to.

Q Did you communicate with anyone on the PAC or the Trump campaign with WhatsApp?

A It is entirely possible, but it would not have been a primary method of communication. There was no need to use anything other than a telephone or email.

Q Who would you have communicated with on WhatsApp in the campaign?

MR. MUYSKENS: Assuming you did actually.

MR. NIX: Well, on the campaign, I would not have communicated with anyone in my team, because, obviously, the FEC rules would prohibit that. But it's possible that we had communications with either Jared or Brad or Bannon to discuss, you know, commercial relationship.

I know for a fact that Steve Bannon doesn't use WhatsApp. I never communicated with Jared on it. And I don't know that Brad and I have ever

connected on there. So I think it's highly unlikely, is the answer.

BY [REDACTED]

Q But when I asked you just a minute ago, you said it's entirely possible.

A Well, what I meant was it's not impossible. I didn't want to lie to you. So I obviously am trying to answer as honestly as possible. It is conceivable that I may have made a WhatsApp message to someone in the campaign. But my recollection is that I did not use WhatsApp.

And when I thought about it for a moment longer, I realized that Steve only uses the telephone. He doesn't even use email that much. And Jared I hardly communicate with. And Brad I don't believe was connected on WhatsApp.

Q What other social media applications do you use? Have you used Signal?

A I have used Signal, yes.

Q Did you use that during the campaign?

A I don't believe I did.

Q Did the PAC engage in any voter suppression efforts?

A No, it did not.

MR. MUYSKENS: Hey, [REDACTED] how much longer is this going on? It's getting a little redundant.

[REDACTED] Let me see if -- we'll go off the record for a minute.

[Discussion held off the record.]

[12:28 p.m.]

[REDACTED] We can go back on the record.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Nix, a Columbia University technology expert, in October 2017, wrote an article on the website "Medium" pointing out that a data scientist intern named Michael Phillips, who apparently may have been Cambridge Analytica's chief data scientist or somehow was employed by Cambridge Analytica during the time of the Trump campaign, had left source code on the site GitHub.

Are you aware of that incident?

A Well, let me start by qualifying the fact that it's very unlikely that a data science intern would have been our chief data scientist. I think the clue is in the word "intern."

As to your question, I am aware of what you're talking about, and this code was personal code that he had written that had nothing to do with Cambridge Analytica nor the work that we were undertaking for the Trump campaign or the super PAC. It was a private project that he was working on and, therefore, not relevant to this line of inquiry.

Q The data apparently included private login information for Cambridge's Twitter data. Is that accurate, to the best of your knowledge?

A I can't comment on that because I haven't read the code. But when the matter came up, I did speak to the senior members of the data team, who assured me that there was nothing confidential nor sensitive nor proprietary in that, and it was specifically a working log on a private project of that individual, which he's entirely entitled to do.

Q Mr. Nix, can you describe the events surrounding Aleksandr Kogan,

the global research scientist -- or Global Science Research, in the acquisition of Facebook data?

A What specific events would you like me to describe, ma'am?

Q According to an in-depth piece by The Intercept in March of this year, Aleksandr Kogan was a Cambridge University lecturer and was contracted by SCL to support SCL's election work.

In 2014, Kogan used an entity, Global Science Research, as a vehicle for recruiting users on Mechanical Turk, an Amazon-owned marketplace where users would bid on performing tasks requiring human intelligence, such as survey-taking.

As part of its terms for user recruitment online, GSR only wanted American participants and required them to download an app that allegedly harvested a wide swath of user data, including their likes, as well as data about the users' friends, apparently without the participants' friends' knowledge or direct consent.

In late 2015, GSR shut down the operation. The Intercept's unnamed sources gave similar accounts, that GSR may have collected between 100,000 and 180,000 Facebook users' data, from which it could then obtain 30 million total Facebook users.

The Intercept article goes on that the purpose of Kogan's work was to develop an algorithm for the national profiling capacity of American citizens as part of SCL's work on U.S. elections.

Have you read that article? Are you aware of those facts?

A I have not read that article. I am not familiar with The Intercept.

Q Do you know Aleksandr Kogan?

A I know Aleksandr Kogan.

Q Was Mr. Kogan contracted or otherwise working for SCL or Cambridge

Analytica to collect Facebook user information via Global Science Research?

A It sounds to me, from listening to what you just read out to me, Aleksandr Kogan was engaged -- or engaged in this program himself.

Q Was he working for SCL?

A Aleksandr Kogan did not work for SCL.

Q Has he worked for Cambridge Analytica?

A No, he hasn't worked for Cambridge Analytica. Aleksandr Kogan undertook a research project, I believe, in the capacity of -- GDS, did you say?

Q GSR.

A I beg your pardon -- in the capacity of GSR and collected a data -- or GSR collected these data. But we did not pay him to undertake this work, if that's what you mean.

Q Is it common practice for acquiring data to inform your analytics and your targeting?

A I'm sorry. I didn't understand the question.

MR. MUYSKENS: You just asked if it's common practice to acquire data to do your analytics. I'm assuming that's not what you meant to ask.

BY [REDACTED]

Q It sounds like Mr. Kogan gathered data from Facebook and users, and users' friends didn't necessarily know the data was being collected. Is that type of information something Cambridge would use?

A Well, look, you'd have to ask Mr. Kogan that, about what his methodology or his research methodology was. I think it's clear from the article that this research was undertaken by Mr. Kogan and not by Cambridge Analytica, so I wouldn't be able to necessarily comment other than to speculate on what he

did and how he did it.

Q What is SCL Elections, and what is Cambridge Analytica's relationship to it?

A Well, I think we've had this discussion. They are both private companies, and we don't comment on the structure or relationship of private companies.

Q What is SCL Elections?

A It's a global election campaign management business.

Q Is it incorporated in the United Kingdom?

A That's correct.

Q Do you have a role in SCL Elections?

A Yes, I do.

Q What is your role?

A CEO.

Q Sorry?

A CEO.

Q For how many companies are you CEO?

A Several. I'm not trying to obfuscate the answer. I don't know.

Q More than 10?

A Less than 10, I should say. Five to 10.

Q Five or 10?

A Five to 10.

Q And are they all privately held companies?

A Yes, they are.

Q Are you aware, Mr. Nix, of the declassified Intelligence Community

report assessing Russian activities and intentions in the recent U.S. election?

A What was the question?

MR. MUYSKENS: Are you familiar with some report?

MR. NIX: Sorry. Did you ask if I'm familiar with the report?

██████████ Yes.

MR. NIX: No, I'm not familiar with the report. I'm sorry.

BY ██████████

Q Have you heard the reports of the U.S. Intelligence Community assessment that Russia interfered in the U.S. election?

A No, I haven't heard any specifics from that report. I am familiar with commentary to that effect that is being circulated in the media.

Q At the Lisbon web summit last month, according to The Wall Street Journal, you called the notion that Russians, quote, significantly interfered in the U.S. election as, frankly, absurd.

A Yes. The context of that reply was to a question about whether I thought it was possible for the Russians to engender a data analytics and communication capability similar to that of Cambridge Analytica in the timeframe that would have been available in this election.

So the notion that the Russians could have built and managed an operation similar to ours, which only could have started, assuming that their intention was to support President Trump, post-nomination -- so the idea that they could achieve that in 5 months, which had taken us 4 years to build, for me, was unrealistic.

Q That's helpful, to have the context.

There has been a lot of public reporting tying Cambridge Analytica to the pro-Brexit effort. What role, if any, did Cambridge play during Brexit?

A Cambridge Analytica played absolutely no role whatsoever in the referendum on independence from Europe.

Q No role on behalf of Leave EU?

A No role on behalf of any organization, movement, political party, or association whatsoever. We undertook no paid nor unpaid work. We were not involved in the referendum. We did not engage in any party on Brexit.

Q Did you pitch your company to try to obtain work on the Brexit --

A Yes, we pitched our company to a number of different parties involved with Brexit on both sides, both for and against.

Q Did you personally contribute or donate to the pro-Brexit effort?

A No, I did not.

May I ask what this has to do with Russian interference in U.S. election?

Q We are truly almost done. I appreciate you bearing with us. I think I have one page of questions left.

What type of work has Cambridge Analytica done in other countries on behalf of foreign political campaigns?

A Cambridge Analytica offers its services to political parties all over the world that engage -- or, I should say, mainstream political parties all over the world that engage in free and fair elections. Typically, we undertake seven or eight elections a year for Prime Minister or President. These could be in Latin America, Africa, Asia, Europe.

And we offer a similar suite of services to those which we offered the Trump campaign and, indeed, Senator Cruz's Presidential primary and, indeed, various other campaigns in the U.S., which are centered around a data-driven approach to campaigning and communication.

Q Did you work on Marine Le Pen's campaign?

A We don't discuss other client projects.

Q You discussed Brexit earlier.

MR. MUYSKENS: And you also asked him his personal opinion of it. I don't really see why any of this is relevant. But let's hurry up, please.

MR. NIX: I've already discussed Brexit widely in the media over the last year -- in fact, extensively in the media over the last year.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Your firm, were you involved in the Carson and the Cruz campaigns?

A That's correct.

Q Did you ever meet Michael Flynn from the Trump campaign?

A Yes, I did.

Q And when did you first meet Mr. -- General Flynn?

A General Flynn. Again, difficult to put a date on it, but I might suggest around May 2016. I'm sure it's in this email list that you've given me.

Q How many times have you -- why did you first meet him? What were those circumstances?

A Cambridge Analytica/SCL has a government and defense division that I discussed earlier in this interview. We set that up in 2003. We decided last year that we wanted to move this division from the U.K. to become a U.S. government and defense company. And in order to become a U.S. company and have a U.S. board with Secret clearance, we needed to have high-level former and current serving personnel oversee our board of activity.

General Flynn was one of the individuals that was identified as possibly being a suitable consultant/adviser to the company. Given his background as

both a Delta Force soldier, obviously a three-star general, head of the DIA, and obviously his experience in the commercial space, he was ideally placed to help an emerging company such as ours to break into the U.S. defense space.

Q Who recommended General Flynn to you?

A Gosh, I don't know. I think I'd come across him -- I think I knew his name. We'd had a bit of business in U.S. defense for nearly 12 or 13 years by that stage. But I don't know how, specifically, I came across him.

Q Did your defense division ever move to the U.S.?

A Did it ever?

Q Yes.

A Yes. We have an office located in Arlington, as I mentioned earlier.

Q Did you hire General Flynn as a consultant?

A We made an offer to General Flynn to become an adviser/consultant to the company. We were in the process of formalizing that relationship contractually when he was offered a place in the administration.

As a result of that and before he could contract and accept, formally accept, a role with Cambridge Analytica, he had to decline, as do all personnel joining the administration. They're no longer allowed to have roles or associations with private companies.

Q Is General Flynn -- did he become a board member?

A No, he was never offered a seat on the board. He was only ever offered a role as an adviser. And, as I mentioned, before he was able to formally accept and contract this role, he had to turn it down.

Q How many meetings did you have with General Flynn after that initial May 2016 meeting?

A I had no formal meetings with General Flynn following that meeting. I met him a couple of times casually but nothing formal.

Q I just have a couple of individuals to ask you about, and then we'll wrap up.

There has been public reporting of a gentleman named Vincent Tchenguiz -- and I'm destroying that name, I'm sure -- that he owned 25 percent of SCL Group through Consensus Business Group, which employed current SCL Chairman Julian Wheatland. And this public reporting is that he won over a million dollars in the U.S. election, and then he bet on the French election. Do you --

A Won?

Q Do you know him?

A I do know him.

Q He apparently sold his shares of SCL within weeks of Ted Cruz announcing that he was running in 2015. Does he work for SCL?

A No, he does not. He has absolutely no connection with SCL.

Q Do you know a gentleman named Dmitry Firtach?

A No, I've never heard that name.

Q Have you ever met Roger Stone?

A No, I've never met Roger Stone.

Q Ever communicated with him?

A Yes, I think I have, but I'm going to struggle to remember what it was about. I think I sent him an email soliciting some work or exploring a work opportunity, but I believe that he didn't even reply.

Q Have you ever done work for Nigel Farage?

A No, never.

Q Have you ever met George Papadopoulos?

A No, never.

Q Carter Page?

A Never. Never met them, don't know them.

Q Walid Phares?

A Never heard that name, don't know them.

Q Dmitry Peskov?

A Don't know that name, never met them.

Q Igor Sechin?

A Likewise, don't know them, never met them.

██████████ I believe that wraps up our questions. I appreciate your patience today and this evening. On behalf of Congressman Schiff and the other Democratic members of the committee, I really do appreciate you doing this by VTC. Not ideal. But thank you very much for your time.

██████████ Thanks very much, Mr. Nix. We greatly appreciate it.

MR. NIX: Thank you, ma'am.

Thank you, sir.

MR. MUYSKENS: If I could add one thing before we are done, if you don't mind, before we go off the record?

██████████ Certainly.

MR. MUYSKENS: Thank you.

The first thing is we, Cambridge Analytica, has been very cooperative throughout this entire matter. When asked to voluntarily provide documents, we did so. We didn't hem and haw about scope or anything like that, but we provided

you with what we thought you would need.

Then, following that, when we were asked to provide this interview, we did so. While it may not have been in the U.S., we were told we needed to do it as soon as humanly possible, and these were the days that worked.

So the earlier insinuation that there was some form -- that it was our fault that this was happening this way is preposterous. We are doing this to be as helpful as humanly possible, as I said before. Our assistance throughout this has been thorough, been complete. I think it's been very effective.

So, with that said, you know, to be rewarded for his cooperation by having you guys try to call my client and avoid counsel, whether inadvertent or not, we would ask that you not do that again, that if you do have any further inquiries, you do go through counsel, as is required for any of your staff with legal degrees or bar licenses. I would hope you would do that.

██████████ If I could, also while we're on the record -- and I do agree with you; you have been tremendously helpful and cooperative. And I do recall you calling me early on in this --

MR. MUYSKENS: Yeah. And I wasn't quite finished, but thank you.

██████████ Oh, no, go ahead and finish then.

MR. MUYSKENS: My next comment was, if you don't mind me finishing, during this interview, we've already -- Cambridge Analytica has had several inquiries from the media asking about the Skype conversation at Greenberg Traurig's office.

You know, I find that very troublesome. You know, I mentioned this earlier, but then we've gotten additional inquiries as we've sat here. You know, I don't know who's sitting here twittering or tweeting -- or whatever the word might

be -- about this meeting, but I think it's unbecoming of the House Intel Committee to allow these leaks out.

So, with that said, we would encourage you, as we continue to cooperate, we would ask you to please recognize our desire for the confidentiality that we have assumed and been told is coming. And, you know, going forward, I would also encourage the committee to maybe look in to who might be the one leaking this information. You are the House Intel Committee. It is unbecoming of your committee to have this sort of thing being broadcast live.

And just for the record, you may want to see who's been, you know, discussing this with a certain Mark Hosenball at Thomson Reuters, because he's the one who is asking currently about our Skype conversation.

With that said, I do appreciate you guys finishing this up. And if you do need anything in the future, we will entertain any reasonable request, and we want to continue to be as cooperative as we can be.

[REDACTED] Thanks. Mr. Muyskens, Mr. Nix, we appreciate, on behalf of the majority -- this is [REDACTED] We'll take your concerns into full consideration, and we agree with your statement regarding confidentiality.

And I can only speak on behalf of the majority, that there is absolutely no person or member or staff on behalf of the majority that in any way violated the confidentiality agreement and the terms of this agreement or its arrangement and discussed it to the press, especially not so during the course of the interview, which we greatly appreciate your patience -- which has now gone on some 4-plus hours.

Thank you, gentlemen. I hope you have a good day.

[REDACTED] And before we go off the record, I'd just like to make a

couple comments.

You have been extremely cooperative. And I think I mentioned earlier, I did have a conversation with you early on and appreciated you encouraging us to go to SLAC and receive the supplemental production. And they were also very cooperative.

And if any of the minority members or we in any way insinuated that there was an issue with you and scheduling, that was not our intent at all. Our colleagues in the majority have not included us in the process of scheduling the interviews, so we were unaware of how this came to be. And that has not a thing to do with you gentlemen.

I am unclear about the one matter you raised regarding someone contacting Cambridge Analytica and not going through counsel. We certainly did not do that and would not do that, especially in light of knowing yourself and that Cambridge is duly represented.

MR. MUYSKENS: Well, the request for -- and one reason, I mean, this took a little while to schedule is, I guess, this letter that asked for Mr. Nix to appear went to Cambridge Analytica. It did not go to me or Greenberg Traurig.

And, you know, if I'm assured that, going forward, you will reach out to counsel first, I have no problem with it. If you are going to continue to reach out to my clients and go around me, I will have a big problem with it.

[REDACTED] That makes sense.

MR. MUYSKENS: Is that fair?

[REDACTED] Fair enough.

We are adjourned.

[REDACTED] Thank you, gentlemen.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[Whereupon, at 1:01 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE